865.g.1
54

THE Counterfeit Christian DETECTED;

And the

REAL QUAKER JUSTIFIED.

Of { God and Scripture, / Reason & Antiquity. } against

The Vile *Forgeries*, Gross *Perversions*, Black *Slanders*, Plain *Contradictions* & *Scurrilous Language* of *T. HICKS* an *Anabaptist* Preacher, in his Third *DIALOGUE* between a *Christian* and a *Quaker*, call'd, *The* Quaker *Condemned*, *&c.*

By way of *Appeal* to all sober People, especially those called *Anabaptists* in and about the City of *London.*

By a Lover of Truth and Peace W. P.

The Vile Person will speak Villany, and his Heart will work Iniquity, to practise Hypocrisie, and to utter Error against the Lord, Isa. 32. 6.

But ye are Forgers of Lyes, ye are all Physitians of no value, Job 13. 4.

Printed in the Year 1674.

Reader,

IT was about a Moneth after the Publication of T. Hicks's last Dialogue, ere I knew there was such a Pamphlet in the World; I took great Care to get it, and then us'd no leſs Diligence to peruſe it, which having done, I ſhall briefly and faithfully give thee my Senſe, both of the Man and his Work, and, I hope, ſufficient Proof to juſtifie that Account.

Some were of the mind, our full and ſober Anſwer to his other diſingenuous Dialogues, with that Remembrance we gave him of his own former Diſlike and Reprehenſion of that unfair way of writing Controverſie, to ſome of his own Profeſſion in Wiltſhire, would have had ſome place with him, and influence upon him, towards a more juſt Proceed with us for the future; That inſtead of a Man of Straw, and a Fool and a Knave of his own creating (and therefore call'd by him a Quaker, that he might the better entitle us to his invented Error, Blaſphemy and Immoralities, and bring us under the Odium that follows) we ſhould have ſeen, if not a real Contrition for the Wrong done us, at leaſt, if in the Wrong our ſelves, ſome Arguments more fairly given, and tenderly preſt, in order to reclaim us: But in lieu of a ſolid & edifying Confutation (were we in the Wrong) the Man is become reſolv'd and deſperate; without all regard to

God, Reason, Scripture, his own Credit, and the Repute of his Party (not a little weakned by his Carriage) for it seems no matter with him how black the Stratagem be, provided it renders but the Quakers *and their Faith detestable. And so remote is he from the least Acknowledgment of his former Miscarriages, to wit,* Forgeries, Perversions, Evasions, Lyes, Slanders *and* Railings, *that with regret I speak it, he has presumtuously continued & advanced in that Ungodly Practice, as if he would maintain one Iniquity by the doubled Confidence of another; increasing, with the number of his Dialogues, the number of those Impieties, for which his other two were so frequently rejected of sober and well-disposed People. Now if the man be so bad, and that in his Book too, how his Book can be good, is beyond the Skill of any man to tell us. That he deserves no better Character at any good man's hand, and that I write but the very Truth of the Matter, I shall proceed to manifest by such* Instances *and* Evidences, *as I think cannot be justly questioned of either Reason or Sense.*

Reader, *be but intent and impartial in thy perusal, and I desire no more at thy hands to our Vindication and our Adversary's utter Shame.* Farewel.

THE

THE Counterfeit Christian DETECTED;

NOt long after *Tho. Hicks* had brought forth his first piece of *Fiction*, being charged by several, as well those that were not of our Way, as our own Friends, with having made a *Quaker* of his own (and no wonder then that he should confute him) he, as one concern'd to buoy up his Credit above those Assaults, writes the *Continuation*, or Second Part, endeavouring to make appear, that he had not wrong'd us in his first. I undertook to consider them, and that in a Spirit of Moderation, to the People of his Profession, and to him, at most, but in a Way of grave Rebuke of his Unchristian Practice. In this I represented his *Forgery*, with many other of his Unrighteous Dealings towards our Persons and Profession. At this he fumed and raged; and where he might safely do it, in City and Country, I was a *Knave*, and I know not how many more Hard Names, that both suit his *Envy, predominant Passions and sordid Practice*, to the Disgrace of his Religious Pretences. But it has so happened, that about a Year's time after, he has thought it requisit to give us six Sheets, which are to advocate his Cause, and prove to the World that I am *an Arrogant, Abusive, Prophane, Impertinent Man*, with

abundance of the like Dirt, out of his foul Pit, which he loads almost every Page withal.

The Intent of this last Undertaking, *is to condemn us out of our own Mouth*, and shew to the World, that we verifie what before he had charged upon us, and we so confidently denyed: But if upon Examination, it shall appear, that my Charges against him remain firm, and that by the Assistance of this last *Dialogue* it self, I hope, notwithstanding his high Rants, mighty Confidence, most positive and dogmatical *Say-so's*, and hard and scornful Names, with which he endeavours to over-bear us, he shall be reputed the man we have describ'd him, and therefore unworthy of the Name of *Christian*, which he untruly gives himself in his *Dialogues*.

---

§. I. Tho. Hicks *proved guilty of Forgery.*

I Shall begin with an Account of his Title-Page, and what he promises his *Reader* there; *The* Quaker *condemned out of his own Mouth, or an Answer to* W. Penn's *Book, entituled,* Reason against Railing, and Truth against Fiction; *wherein* W. P. *hath confessed,* That if those things objected against the *Quakers* in two former *Dialogues* be true, that then a *Quaker* is quite another thing then a *Christian. That those Matters heretofore objected were and are real Truths, and no Fictions is fully cleared and evinced in this Third Dialogue between a* Christian *and a* Quaker, *by* THOMAS HICKS, Tit. Pag.

That a *Quaker* is Condemned out of *Tho. Hicks's* Mouth, is no Wonder to me; but that he should be

Con-

Condemned out of his own, would be ſtrange, and is, we hope, a Task too difficult for him to ſurmount. However, he tells us, that what things he objected againſt us in his former *Dialogues*, called *Fictions* by us, are cleared and evinced to be no Fictions, but *real Truths* by him: This is either true or falſe; if true, we are wrong; if falſe, *T. Hicks* is ſtill to be reputed a *Forger*.

He that would clear himſelf from any Charge, muſt be ſure to take into his Anſwer the Matter of that Charge, or he ſhuffles with his Adverſary, and maketh no allowable Defence for himſelf. That this is *T. Hick's* Caſe, *inſtead of Condemning the* Quaker *out of his own Mouth*, and conſequently that he is worthy to be condemned himſelf for his Enterpriſe, I ſhall briefly ſhew.

I charged him at the Entrance into my former Book, with having anſwer'd his own knottieſt Queſtions in our Name, with the moſt weak and impertinent Returns he could well invent; and in many Pages there was not ſo much as a Quotation to be ſeen (a Practice to be deteſted of any that have learned but the very *Alphabet* of Common Honeſty) to which the man ſayes nothing, yet would be thought a fair Diſputant, yea, a *Chriſtian* too, if any Body will believe him.

Next I charged him with having given ſome Anſwers, we could acknowledge ours, joyned to their proper Queſtions, unto ſuch Queſtions, as they were never returned to, therefore guilty of *Forgery*, though not in making them Anſwers at all; yet in giving them for Anſwers to thoſe Queſtions unto which they never related, which is a manifeſt Miſapplication of them; But of this neither do we hear one word.

Again, though what he has ſaid in his Title-Page, be enough for us, and we ſhall anon deſcend to uſe it, yet

does not that contain or reach my Queſtion, as in Honeſty it ought to have done, which was this; *Whether thoſe Doctrines and Expreſſions charged upon the People called* Quakers, *by* Tho. Hicks *in both his* Dialogues, *be really the Doctrines and Sayings of that People, or not?* And afterwards, *Whether what we own, and is by him charged with Error, is ſufficiently oppoſed or proved ſuch?* Reaſon againſt Railing, p. 6. which, *Reader*, takes in not only what *T. H.* objects againſt the *Quakers, but what he invents and anſwers for them, and under their Name, whether it be about Doctrine or Practice.* Nor is this all that may be learned of *T. Hicks* in his Title-Page; For, to compleat his Baſeneſs in that very Paſſage, obſerve, that as he only renders us concerned at his *Objections*, ſo does he confine theſe words [*are real Truths and no Fictions*] unto them. Whereas it is notorious to all that have but turned over my Anſwer, that it was not only, nor indeed ſo much his Objections againſt us, *as thoſe Anſwers he gave for us, that I charged with Fiction.* But *T. Hicks*'s Policy in this Contrivance is not unworthy of our notice, though always of our Approbation; for this is the plain Language of it, *If I uſe not theſe Stratagems to cloud the Queſtion, and vary the Charge, I am a Forger, &c. there's no Help for it; and that diſcards me with all men, even thoſe of my own Party; wherefore I will ſo order the Matter, that I will only bring my ſelf upon the* * *Proof of my own Objections, and over-look theirs.* But though this goes a great way, yet this alone will not do; For I query, Doſt thou intend by *Objections*, which thou ſayeſt I call *Fictions*, all or ſome; if but ſome of them, thou ſhouldſt in Honeſty

* Not that I allow him to have rightly charged us in every thing in that Senſe neither.

neſty have ſaid ſo; if all, as thy words imply, then haſt thou further abuſed us; for my ſtate of the Queſtion includes a grant of ſome of them in point of Citation, though none as Errors.

But, *Reader*, this is *T. Hicks*'s Fetch (for without them he can do nothing againſt us) *If I can extend the word Forgery* or Fiction, *as well to things they do grant, as thoſe* they deny, by ſome ſuch general words, *as Matters objected againſt the* Quakers, *&c.* Then by proving they acknowledge I have rightly quoted and charged them in ſome three or four Particulars, I will clear my ſelf from the foul Imputation of *Forgery* in all the reſt.

That this is the very Truth it ſelf, and therefore *Forgery* in the Abſtract, let the Reader know, that this has been his Practice, to wit, *Where we have never charged Forgery upon him, he has taken his Opportunity, and that with the Confidence of an Innocent* to cry out, *Is this candid to call me a Forger, when you confeſs the thing—Then I am not guilty of Forgery--this clears me from being a Forger--* Examine theſe Pages in his 3d *Dialogue*, viz. p. 4, 5, 6, 9, 29, 36, 39. and mine to which he there refers, and which he pretends to anſwer, and thou wilt have ſuch Evidence of the Truth of what I ſay to thy very Senſe, as muſt needs render my Adverſary's Carriage worthy of thy ſevere Cenſure.

But as he hath attempted the Proof of his Innocency in this Matter, by [illegible]aces that never reflected any ſuch ſort of Guilt upon him (therefore ſtill the man once charged to be) ſo has he wholely declined medling with that very *Head of Forgery*, under which I rancked near *Twenty Anſwers, ſet down by him in our Name, that were never given by us, in either Matter or Form, to thoſe or any other Queſtions*, as a Demonſtration of the

Truth

Truth of my Accuſation; ſome of which are ſo very groſs, that had not his Envy over-powred his Wits, Credit with his ſober Neighbours would have diſ-ſwaded him, if the Apprehenſion of God's Judgments could not have deterred him.

Before I produce Particulars, I ſhall recite a Paſſage in his ſecond *Dialogue*, p. 2. as a Proof of the immeaſurable Confidence, as well as Folly and Wickedneſs of the Man. *Quak.* Thou haſt preſented the World with a *Quaker* of thine own framing, making him to ſpeak thoſe Impertinencies and Falſehoods that were never uttered by any real *Quaker*; Therefore it is a Forgery. *G. W. Epiſtle to D. Pl.* Anab. *You had done well, if you had produced ſome Inſtances wherein I made them ſpeak what was never uttered by a real* Quaker: *But if I can prove that what is ſpoken under that Name is the Language of a real* Quaker; *then thou haſt confeſſed that ſuch may be guilty of Impertinencies and Falſhoods.*

But *T. Hicks* has made them ſpeak what was never uttered by a *Real Quaker*, and has not ſo much as attempted to *prove* the contrary; Therefore *T. Hicks* by his own Argument is guilty *of Impertinencies and Falſhoods.* This I made appear in my Anſwer to his former *Dialogues*; and therein *did well* by his own Confeſſion; For I produced ſeveral Paſſages to make good my Charge of *Forgery*, unto which he is wholely ſilent. I ſhall inſtance in three or four of them, that my *Reader* may both perceive the Spirit of the man, and ſee at what rate he has clear'd himſelf from my Imputations.

Anabapt. *Is it honeſt in you to deny the Scripture to be a Rule to others, when at the ſame time you make it a Rule to your ſelves?* Dial. 1. pag. 24, 52.

Quak. Thou miſtakeſt us; when we make uſe of the

the Scriptures, it is only to quiet and ſtop their Clamours, that plead for it as their Rule.

Anab. *Do you believe the Scriptures to be the true Sayings of God*, ibid. p. 25, 2.

Quak. Yea, ſo far as they agree with the Light within.

Anab. *May I not conclude, that the Reaſon why you ſo freely rail againſt and reproach your Oppoſers, is only to ſecure your Credit with your Proſelytes*, ibid. p. 72, 73.

Quak. I cannot deny but that there may be ſomething of that in it.

Anab. *Will this convince me or any other of your Perfection?* ibid.

Quak. Though it do not, yet thereby we ſhall render you ſo Odious to our Friends, that they will believe nothing that is ſpoken by you againſt us.

Anab. *Will you be ſo liberal of your Revilings, whether your Adverſaries give occaſion or no?* ibid.

Quak. It concerns us to render them as ridiculous as we can, *and to make our Friends believe, they do nothing* but contradict themſelves: And if this fail, *we will inſinuate ſomething by way of Queſtion, that may be Reproachful to them.*

Anab. *But doth not this ſignifie a very Diſhoneſt and Malicious Mind?* ibid.

Quak. We care not what you think, *provided our Friends think not ſo. We will give it out, that we have both anſwer'd and confuted our Adverſaries, and our Friends will believe us, which is enough to us.*

What a Wicked and Falſe *Quaker* this counterfeit *Chriſtian* hath made to abuſe true ones? If this be not *Forgery, palpable Forgery*, and that not only againſt ſome one Perſon, but the People in general, perſonated by his *own made Quaker*, there is no ſuch thing as *Forgery*

gery in the World. Oh you that ſeriouſly profeſs *Religion*, can you away with this?

But hath he vindicated himſelf from theſe baſe Courſes, or honeſtly confeſſed them? *Neither*. How then can he juſtly call himſelf a *Chriſtian*, or be thought to have anſwered my Book, that hath thus baſely declined that part of it, which ſtood him moſt upon to diſprove? But how groſly ſoever he hath repreſented us, and how ſilently overlookt our Charges, he wants not Confidence to write after this Strain; *I do affirm in ſerioufneſs, that the Account I have now, and heretofore given of the* Quakers, *is no other then the very Truth*, Epiſt. p. 5. How ſerious is this Man in his Lying? *Forge* firſt, and then *Lye* to prop it: Impudence in Grain!

For what he hath ſaid heretofore relating to this particular, I have here briefly conſidered it. Let us ſee if he be any better now; In order to it, I have already ſhown you the Shuffle of his *Title-page*: I will now proceed to give you an Account of his Progreſs in this *Black Art* of *Forgery* and baſe *Abuſe*.

Anabapt. *I am not conſcious of having objected any thing againſt you in my former Dialogues, but what I am certainly perſwaded to be true*, p. 1.

But is not *T. Hicks* conſcious of firſt making us ſay that we never ſaid, & then calling it, *A Dialogue between a* Chriſtian *and a* Quaker? That *T. Hicks* was a *Forger*, I have evidenced: That he is one ſtill, his own words ſhew; for inſtead of retracting, he pleads Innocency in being ſo: No wonder this man can write againſt the Light within; whoſe Conſcience, if we will believe him, is ſo ſeared, that it feels no Riſings againſt the fouleſt *Forgeries*. But let's hear him a little further.

Anabapt. *I am ſo confident of the Truth of thoſe Allegations*,

legations, that I doubt not to avouch them, to all impartial men, Ibid.

We never doubted his Confidence, but Honesty. His *Allegations* must either respect those Passages, which he book'd,& pag'd, or else all that he alledges under the Name of *Quaker*: If the former, he is a *Forger* still; for more then Three Hundred in his first *Dialogue* were neither book'd nor pag'd: If the latter, he tells a plain Untruth; for he has not so much as attempted to avouch them, unless it is to be understood of his Confidence.

Seven Instances I shall give of his Continuance in FORGERY.

I. *T. Hicks*'s first *Forgery* begins with his *Title-Page*, and in that very Passage, where he promiseth *an Evincement of his own Objections to be no Fictions, but real Truths*; to wit, that he doth not only content himself in making the Evincement of his own Objections against us (unfairly over-looking ours) to be all he is concern'd in, but in so many words tells the World, *That I confess, if those things objected against the* Quakers *in the two former* Dialogues *be true, that then a* Quaker *is quite another thing then a* Christian; who never said or confessed any such thing in all my Life: For I well knew, that the Controversie rise higher, and went further then his meer Objections; I mean, *to all he gave under our Name*; as both the Question stated, and my Pursuit of it do evidently prove. So that he, to make the clearing of his own Objections enough (yet more then he can ever do) brings me in with a Confession of a thing I never

ver thought on, much leſs ever writ; what ſhall I call this but *Forgery* upon *Forgery*?

II. His Second *Forgery* brings me in thus: Qu. *If thy Quotations be true, I do freely acknowledge, that a* Quaker *is quite another thing then a* Chriſtian, Reaſ. againſt Rail. p. 2.

There is no Paſſage ſo laid down by me; my words are theſe, T. Hicks *hath given us a Second Part, wherein he hopes to make good, what he charged upon us in his firſt by Quotations out of our own Books*; If faithfully done, *I ſhall freely acknowledge that a* Quaker *is quite another thing then a* Chriſtian. Where it is obſervable, that I do not lay the Hazard of a *Quaker*'s being a *Chriſtian*, meerly upon the Truth of his Quotations, but the Uſe of and Application of them, *if they be faithfully done*; that is, if he can make thoſe Quotations and his Charges meet againſt us, I ſhall concede; for a Quotation implies an Agreement. He hoped to creep out at a few right Citings, *and to be over look'd all falſe Applying and Perverting* by unnatural Conſequences to his Crooked Purpoſe. Though had I ſaid, as he ſets me down, I ſhould have no Cauſe to fear the Iſſue; ſince if Naming us may go for quoting, he has done it an Hundred times, where he has directed to no particular Way of knowing the Truth thereof, conſequently a *Forger*; and where he has been more punctual, I dare abide by every ſuch one he ever made, well knowing, he cannot get one Letter to ſpeak for him, but by his meer Sophiſtry and cuſtomary Wreſts.

III. His

III. His Third *Forgery* in this 3d *Dialogue* is thus laid down by him. He begins with an Answer to the last Passage he quoted for mine.

Anabapt. *Art thou well advised in what thou sayest*? p. 1, 2.

Quak. Were we as thou representest us, the severest Plagues and Judgments of the Eternal God we might justly expect to be our Portion, *Reas. against Rail.* pag. 4.

The Stress lies here, Whether this Answer were ever given by me to the Question 'tis now made an Answer to? I say, *No*; Therefore a *Forger*. Next, let us see if it was ever given to a Question of the like Tendency? *No*; therefore the greater *Forger*. I will set down the two Passages unto which this hath been given twice for Answer, that my *Reader* may be helpt to a clearer Sight of the Man.

In this third *Dialogue* he queries of me:

Anab. *Art thou well advised in what thou sayest, in saying, If my Quotations be true, thou dost freely acknowledge that a* Quaker *is quite another thing than a* Christian, Dial. 3. p. 1.

Quak. Were we as thou representest us, the severest Plagues and Judgments of the eternal God we might justly expect to be our Portion, *R. against R.* p. 4.

Thus *T. H.* layes it down: But let us see how it is in my Book.

T. H. queries, *Will you be so liberal of your Revilings, whether your Adversary give occasion or not*? He answereth for us: Quak. *It concerns us to render them as ridiculous as we can, and to make our Friends believe, They do nothing*

nothing but contradict themſelves, which is enough to us. Upon which *Reader*, I made this Reflection: *Certainly theſe things ſhew ſuch premeditated and willfull Obſtinacy, to be Wicked, that were we what he repreſents us to be* IN THIS VERY MATTER, *the ſevereſt Plagues and Judgments of the eternal God we might juſtly expect to be our Portion*, &c. p. 4. If only ſaid IN THIS VERY MATTER, then not in every Matter *T. Hicks* pleaſeth to wreſt or twiſt it to: Oh groſs Abuſe! Shall this Man go for a *Chriſtian*? But his Evil is greatly hightned, when we conſider, that theſe Words were ſpoken of ſuch a Paſſage, as to this Minute he never ſo much as attempted to clear from the Imputation of *Forgery*, though ſo charged upon him, *pag.* 67. of my Anſwer; becauſe there was no Quotation for it, nor in ſenſe can be expected for ſo plain a *Fiction*: And yet he makes it a formal Anſwer to a Queſtion about right and wrong Quotations, which were not there in Queſtion; as if it were one and the ſame thing, to ſay, The Plagues and Judgments of God we might expect, &c. *if ſo morally Evil as he brought us in ſpeaking our ſelves to be*, for which he directed us to no particular Proof, neither could: And to ſay, We might juſtly expect the Plagues and Judgments of God, &c. *if he repreſented us right, as to Quotations about Doctrines out of our own Books, which was never the Queſtion.* He that can thus invent, add, diminiſh, and tranſpoſe, both Words and Sentences, may write *Dialogues* at Pleaſure, and as eaſily abuſe the Prophets and Apoſtles, yea, *Chriſt Jeſus* himſelf, as the People called *Quakers*.

IIII. His Fourth *Forgery* he makes, and that I think fit to remark, is this. *Anab.*

Anab. But doeſt thou indeed believe, that thoſe Quotations in the former Dialogues are Forgeries?

Quak. *I do ſo*, Dial. 3. p. 2.

This is all falſe: I never thought ſo, much leſs writ ſo; nor was that the Queſtion, taking *Quotations* for places cited, as to Book and Page. And if generally accepted by him, he brings me in denying all, which was as much beſide my Thoughts.

Thus he ſhuffles with me, and endeavours to delude ſimple People by the word *Quotation* (which taken ſtrictly, does not reach the one half of thoſe Anſwers he made us to give) by getting a few Paſſages acknowledged, which he has punctually made (though miſerably perverted) to make them believe, all given under our Name, not ſo cited, are alſo allowed under the ſame Term [*Quotations.*]

Beſides, he has not referred us for any ſuch Anſwer in any Book I ever wrot. This, Reader, is ſo far from proving and evincing former Charges againſt us, that it is to multiply more *Fictions*, and add to his other Score.

V. His Fifth *Forgery* is in page 59. and conſiſts of two Parts: The firſt is, The foiſting in of the Word *only*, The ſecond of miſ-placing and applying my Anſwer, that he may the better have his Ends upon me, which is but one of his many unruly *reigning* Sins. Obſerve, becauſe I told him, that *E.B.* in ſaying, 'That 'was not a Command to him, which was a Command 'to another, *reſpected not thoſe univerſal and eternal Precepts of fearing God, and working Righteouſneſs* (as *T. H.* untruly inferr'd) *But more extraordinary and particular Injunctions; ſuch as the Going of* Moſes *to*

Pharaoh, *with many more*. And becauſe I explain an other Paſſage out of *E. B.* by him cited and wreſted, viz. 'You are not dead with Chriſt, who are yet ſubject to 'Ordinances; after this manner, E. B. *pleads* ONLY *againſt ſuch Ordinances, as were but Shadowy, and to paſs off*; He puts the Adverb *Only*, by me mentioned, in what I ſaid to this laſt Citation out of *E. B.* in my Explanation of the firſt Citation, where I never mentioned it. And that he might faſten a Contradiction upon me, he omits this laſt Citation out of *E. B.* mentioned in his ſecond *Dialogue*, and makes the Anſwer I gave to his Uſe of it, to belong to that which I gave to the former about Commands, as if they had been but one entire Anſwer to one and the ſame Paſſage, which were really two.

The Advantage he hoped to gain, was this, that I ſhould ſay, *E. B.* intended by Commands, only extraordinary Ones, as *Moſes*'s going to *Pharoah*, &c. and yet ſay, *That* E. B. *only meant ſuch Ordinances as are Shadowy*; if *only* ſuch extraordinary, then not *only* ſuch Shadowy; if *only* ſuch ſhadowy, then not *only* ſuch extraordinary; as if they had been ſaid of the ſame Paſſage, and on the ſame Occaſion; whereas the firſt was in page 47. of *E. B*'s Works, and the other in page 105. as *T. Hicks* himſelf quotes them, in his ſecond *Dialogue*, p. 59, 61.

But that which yet adds Blackneſs to this *Forgery*, is firſt, that, at what time he foiſted into my Explanation of the firſt Paſſage, he baſely left out theſe three Words [with many more] which were on Purpoſe to ſhew I did not ſtint *E. B*'s Uſe of the Word *Command*, to the extraordinary Cases, inſtanced in my Anſwer. And next

that

that, after all that premeditated Injuſtice, he flings theſe ſtinking Interrogatories at me, *Doſt thou conſult thy Credit in multiplying ſuch Inſtances of thy Inadvertency and Folly? What Reaſon hath any Man to believe thee, either in what thou affirmeſt or denyeſt, that doſt ſo apparently contradict thy ſelf?* This is not only to be bad, but brazen withall. To contradict a Man's ſelf is reproveable; but to make Contradictions in another Man's Name, is deteſtable: To commit Injuries againſt any is ill done; but to brave the wronged with inſolent Reflections muſt needs be a great Aggravation. What think the more ſober among the *Baptiſts* of theſe Things?

VI. The Sixth *Forgery* I ſhall now mention is the Anſwer *T. H.* makes *G. W.* to give in his ſecond *Dialogue*, pag. 1. The Queſtion and Anſwer I will recite.

Anab. *I have formerly detected you of ſeveral pernicious Errors, concerning the Scriptures, Light within, Perſon of Chriſt and Reſurrection, &c. What ſay you thereunto?*

Quak. I ſay, The Plagues and Judgments of God will follow thee.

G. W. denies that this was ever his Anſwer to that Queſtion, *Appendix, p.* 13. Though he at the ſame time tells *T. H.* he no wayes doubts the Thing. *T. H.* that he may not lye under the Charge of *Forgery*, ſo fixt upon him by *G. W.* has by his *Legerdemain*, p. 69. trapt in *Joh. Gladman*, to cloak his Fiction, thus; *Whereas* G. W. *denies that he ſaid*, The Plagues and Judgments of God would follow *T. Hicks, theſe may certifie, that* G. W. *and my ſelf being in Diſcourſe about the Dialogue* between a Chriſtian and a Quaker, *he ſaid*, The Plagues

and Judgments of God would follow *T. Hicks*, and all that had a Hand in that *Dialogue*, or that diſperſt it. *J. Gladman*, *Dial.* p. 85.

But the Meaneſs of the Shift aggravates the *Forgery*: Did *G. W.* ever deny that he had ſaid ſo to *J. G.* or was that the Queſtion? Vain Man! or tell us, Does *J. Gladman* certifie, that *G. W.* ſaid ſo to *T. H.* at what time he controverſially askt him that Queſtion? Which is to come cloſe to the Queſtion: Or does he ſay, there ever was any ſuch Queſtion askt him? Clear 'tis, *G. W.* never deny'd that he had ſpoken thoſe words, or to the ſame Effects, to any Body at any time, or upon any Occaſion (Therefore hath *J. G.* alſo manifeſtly wronged him in ſaying, *whereas* G. W. *denies that he ſaid, &c.* this is an Untruth, as is evident by *G. W's* own Anſwer, *Appendix* p. 13.) and as evident it is, that the Subſtance of this Certificate goes no further then to teſtifie that which was never yet denied; *Therefore no Certificate to clear the Matter objected againſt* T.H. to wit, That he never received by Word or Writing any ſuch Queſtion from *T. H.* much leſs did he ever return him *any ſuch Anſwer*; conſequently *T. H.* a *Forger* ſtill.

I will briefly parallel the Caſe: Let us ſuppoſe a Diſpute between *T. Hicks* a *Predeſtinarian*, and *J. Ives* an *Univerſaliſt*, both *Anabaptiſts*, about *Election and Reprobation*; And *J. Ives* uſing his Wits to depaint *T. H's* Opinion to greateſt Diſadvantage; which *T. H.* looking upon as Unfair, and thinking himſelf not to have been doctrinally, gravely and juſtly dealt with, as by the Law of Sober Diſputation ſhould have been, falls upon *J. Ives* with this Rebuke, *Thou art an Ungodly, Vain and Captious Man; the Judgments of God will*

will overtake thee, if thou Repent not, for thy daring Oppoſition to the Goſpel, and unfair Dealing with me. *J. Ives* immediately writes a *Dialogue*; the firſt Queſtion ſuppoſe to be this.

J. Ives. What doſt thou ſay, *T. H.* to thoſe groſs and blaſphemous Abſurdities I charged thy Narrow and Ill-natured Opinion with; *of damning men unconditionally from all Eternity to glorifie God*, thereby rendring God *more Cruel then Man and Beaſts, that naturally take care of their Off-ſpring*, repreſenting him *partial* and *double-minded, as having a revealed Will that ſpeaks of his Deſire that all ſhould be ſaved, and a ſecret Will notwithſtanding that damns far the greateſt part, whether they Obey or Rebel?* with much more of the like cruel and black Aſpect. I ſuppoſe, thou haſt conſidered them well; haſt thou any Reaſons to offer in Countenance and Defence of this horrid Opinion? What ſayeſt thou?

T. Hicks is made by *J. Ives* to anſwer thus:

T. H. *I ſay, thou art an Ungodly, Vain and Captious Man; The Judgments of God will overtake thee, if thou Repent not, for thy daring Oppoſition to the Goſpel, and unfair Dealing with me.*

Now, I would ask *T. Hicks*, if he thinks this Reflection, by him given upon the ſuppoſed diſingenuous Carriage of *J. Ives*, to be a proper and ſuitable Anſwer for *J. Ives* to give in his Name to a *doctrinal* Queſtion, unto which, it was never given as an Anſwer? If not, how injuriouſly has he dealt with *G. W*? Are our Rebukes of *T. Hicks*'s Unrighteous and Prophane Carriage in his *Dialogues*, the only Reaſons we are able to render in Defence of our Belief, or againſt his doctrinal Objections? Or may a man honeſtly take another's

Anſwer, and give it to his own Queſtion, however impertinent, and that in the other man's Name, with deſign to render him ſo? If not, then certainly *T. H.* has not acted the *Chriſtian*, but the *Counterfeit* with us: And God will require this Wickedneſs at the Church's Hand to which he relates, if they indulge or connive at it.

VII. His Seventh *Forgery*, and the laſt which I will now ſtand to mention, is this, and I intreat my *Readers* Attention; for *He* or *I* muſt needs be very Guilty.

In his ſecond *Dialogue* pag. 5. he thus brings me in:

Anab. *Be free and plain with me, how and in what reſpect is Chriſt ſaid to fulfil the Law, and to* DYE *for Sinners.*

Quak. He fulfil'd the Law *Onely* as our Pattern or Example. Chriſt is ſo far from telling us of ſuch a Way of being *Juſtified*, as that he informs us the Reaſon why he abode in his Father's Love, was his *Obedience*: He is ſo far from telling us of being Juſtified by Virtue of his Obedience imputed, that unleſs we keep his Commands and obey for our ſelves; in all which Chriſt is but our Example, *Pen. Sand. Found. ſhak.* pag. 26.

To this, *Reader*, I return'd two Pages of Anſwer, in Defence of my Book, and to detect his *Forgery*, ſome of which he hath ventured to give, but with his wonted Diſingenuity perverted: Let us hear him patiently.

Anab. *But foraſmuch as thou ſeemeſt to grant that Chriſt's Death was in the Nature of a Sacrifice, how will this agree with what thou haſt formerly aſſerted?* viz. That Chriſt fulfill'd the Law, *Onely* as our Pattern or Example, *Dial.* 3. pag. 74.

Quak. In this *Quotation* thou haſt done exactly like thy

thy ſelf; for if thou canſt find the word *Onely* there, or ſuch an Anſwer to ſuch a Queſtion, thou haſt not wronged me; But ſure I am, there is no ſuch Queſtion, and as ſure, the Fulfilling of the Law was not the Subject treated on, and very certain, the word Onely was not there; Therefore thou art a *Forger*. That which I ſaid, with the Scripture on which it was grounded, was this: *If ye keep my Commandments, ye ſhall abide in my Love*, &c. *Reaſ. againſt Rail.* pag. 78. *Sand. Found.* p. 26.

Anab. *Here it is hard to ſay, whether thy Diſhoneſty or Impudence be the greater; for in this Anſwer thou art guilty of no leſs then three notorious Untruths: Firſt thou inſinuateſt*, as if the Text above named were the only Text from which thou didſt argue in thy *Sand. Found.* pag. 26. 2*dly*, Thou art ſure, the Fulfilling of the Law was not the Subject treated on there. 3*dly*, Thou art very certain, the word *Only* is not there: *Thus haſt thou aggravated thy Wickedneſs in adding Lye unto Lye, and all this knowingly*, Dial. 3. p. 74, 75.

'Tis now Time for me to ſpeak; and I beſeech thee, *Reader*, hear me; for it is of great moment to determine who is the *Forger*, who is the *Lyar*; T.H. or *W.P.*

Firſt, he ſuggeſts by this Queſtion, *If Chriſt's Death was in the Nature of a Sacrifice, as thou ſayeſt, how will this agree with thy former Aſſertion, That Chriſt fulfill'd the Law*, only *as our Pattern*, as if the Death and Sufferings of Chriſt, as a Propitiation to declare God's Righteouſneſs for the Forgiveneſs of Sins that are paſt, upon Repentance, had been part of that Doctrine in that part of my Book, unto which thoſe Words relate, viz. *Chriſt fulfilled the Law as our Pattern*, which really was no part of that Doctrine, as may be ſeen *pag.* 24, 26.

For becauſe we aſſert him to have been our Example

in Fulfilling the Righteousness of the moral Law, *T. H.* would conclude from my words, *That he was only our Example in ending Types, Shadows, Sacrifices, Propitiations, &c. of the Law*; Therefore great *Forgery* in him, to make me answer two Questions, the one in *pag.* 52. of his second *Dialogue*; the other in *pag.* 74. of his last *Dialogue*, which take in the Death & Sufferings of Christ, *that wholely related to but some part of the personal Obedience of his Life.*

I cannot forbear one Instance more of his foul Miscarriage in this particular, *viz.*

Anab. *Are we no further concern'd in the Obedience and Sufferings of our Lord Jesus without us, then only as our Example or Pattern?*

Quak. What more wouldst thou have? I have told thee, that Christ fulfilled the Law; but *Only* as our Example.

Where there is nothing clearer then that he thrusts the *Sufferings of Christ* into the Question, which was no part of the Question, making me to deny the Benefit thereof, because I assert him to be only our Example in that which is our daily Duty unto Acceptance with God; not in being a Sacrifice for Sin. Is this not to be *Guilty of Fiction*? Or is this to describe a real *Quaker*, and act the part of a true *Christian*? Oh hateful Injuries!

But *2dly*, In his Quotation of my Answer he hath omitted two Passages; for when I said, If he can find such an Answer to such a Question he has not wronged me, I placed these words between, which he dropped, viz. *or the Matter strictly contained in that Question*, which I knew he could never compass, because his Question was, *in what Respect Christ dyed for Sinners*; and the Answer he made me give, truly related to the fulfilling

filling of the Righteouſneſs of the Law in our ſelves. Oh Injurious Man! Is this the *Chriſtian*?

His next Omiſſion is this part of my Anſwer, which followed from my Argument (by him cited for Proof of his Charge) upon *John* 15. 10. If you keep my Commandments, &c. *Now* (ſaid I) *that this concern'd not the whole Law Chriſt came to fulfill; the whole Law he fulfil'd, the place of Scripture quoted, the Nature and Matter of the Argument clearly prove.* Again, *He was our Example in Holineſs, though not in his Ending of Types & Shadows*, Reaſ. againſt Rail. pag. 79. Which Paſſages *Reader*, plainly evidence, that if ever thoſe words were ſpoken by me, they never extended to Chriſt's being but our Example in the Fulfilling *of the whole Law*, which *T. Hicks* by his Sophiſtry would inſinuate.

For Anſwer to his *Three notorious Untruths* he chargeth on me, take what follows. 1. He ſayes I inſinuate as if *John* 15. 10. *were the only Text from whence I argued in my* Sand. Found, *pag.* 26. which, *Reader*, is ſo far from Truth, that I only charg'd him with having argued from that Text in which no ſuch word or matter was to be found, which he denies. 2*dly*, He ſays, *That I am ſure the Fulfilling of the Law was not the Subject treated on there; and that I know therein I have ſpoken falſly.*

But ſure I am he hath told two *Tales* in charging one upon me: For *firſt*, How could the Law, as he underſtands it, to wit, the *Whole* Law that Chriſt came to fulfil, be intended, when the very Text & Argument upon it, ſhew, that it was the Keeping of *Chriſt's Commandments*, that they might abide in his Love, and without which they could not be accepted; that was inſiſted on.

2*dly*, He tells an *Untruth* in charging me with the *Knowledge* of that which was not: But as he declined

this Scripture, ſo the Arguments by which I proved the Impoſſibility of Chriſt's keeping his own Commandements in our ſtead, with which I made good my Concluſion, *viz.* The Neceſſity of Keeping his Commandments as he kept his Father's, in order to Acceptance with him.

3*dly*, He ſayes, *I am certain, the Word Only is not there, and ſo add Lye unto Lye knowingly*; which, *Reader*, makes other *Two Untruths* on my Adverſary's part: For *firſt*, there is no ſuch Word in all that Argument and Paragraph out of which he made his Citation, as may appear *Sand. Found. Shak.* pag. 26. *Argum.* 5. *Dial.* 2. pag. 52. *Reaſ. againſt Rail.* pag. 79. 2*dly*, His ſaying, I ſhould know of a thing that never was, makes up his other Falſhood: But to the end he may acquaint all men with my *Folly and Madneſs*, as he is pleaſed to term his own horrible *Fiction*, he tells me, that he referred in his Citation not to *John* 15. 10. but *Rom.* 2. 13. *Not the Hearers of the Law are juſt before God, but the Doers of the Law ſhall be juſtified.* But do men uſe to refer to Places they never cite, either as to *Words, Chapter* or *Verſe*; for they are not mentioned in his former *Dialogues*: How then did he refer to them?

If he ſayes, It was to my Argument, I make the ſame Demand. Do men refer to *Arguments* they never mention? If to thoſe they do mention, then I can eaſily prove, it was not this Scripture or Argument upon it, that *T. Hicks* referred to. *Reader*, peruſe *Sand. Found.* p. 26. *Arg.* 5. *Dial* 2. p. 52. *Reaſ. againſt Rail.* p. 78, 79. and thou ſhalt ſee his palpable Untruth.

But becauſe he builds here upon this *Argument*, let's hear it: 'Unleſs we be Doers of the Law, which Chriſt 'came not to deſtroy, but as our Example, to fulfill, we

can

'can never be juſt before God: Let not any fancy, that 'Chriſt hath SO fulfill'd it for them, as to *exclude their* 'Obedience, from being requiſite to their Acceptance, 'but *Onely* as their Pattern. Here *Only* is mentioned: But *firſt*, this was not the Place cited, but *another* that had it not, as before expreſt; Therefore I no *Lyar*, but *T. Hicks* a *Forger*. *2dly*, This *Law* mention'd *Rom.*2.13. was the *Moral* & *Eternal Law* of God, & not that *Shadowy Law* containing *Ceremonies*, *Sacrifices*, *Propitiatories*, *Meats*, *Drinks*, and *divers Waſhings*, &c. which Chriſt by his Life, Death and Sufferings fulfill'd and ended, in which *T. H.* would make me ſay, That Chriſt was *Onely* our Example: That it was not the whole *Jewiſh Law*, the two next verſes prove; *For when the* Gentiles *which have not the Law, do the Things contained in the Law, theſe having not the Law, are a Law unto themſelves, which ſhew the Work of the Law written in their Hearts:* Therefore not the whole *Jewiſh* Law, *for that they had not*; conſequently, I do not contradict or make void the Benefit of Chriſt's Death and Sufferings, by ſaying, He was only our Example in keeping that Law which the beſt *Jews* and *Gentiles* were to keep and kept, and the Righteouſneſs of which is to be fulfill'd in us. Thus hath he unworthily *added*, *diminiſhed*, *miſ-rendred*, *tranſpoſed*, &c. from time to time. Certainly, the People call'd *Anabaptiſts*, are deeply concern'd to reckon with him for this *great Scandal* to their Profeſſion.

But ſuppoſe I meant the *whole Law* of God in that place, I ſee no worſe Conſequence from my words then this, That ſo far as man's Obedience to God's Law is requiſite to his Acceptance, ſo far *only* Chriſt became our Example: For as he was not our Pattern in things

that

that more peculiarly related to him to perform and finish; so was he no more then our Pattern in that which is our constant Duty to do. Now let *T. H.* snap and catch what he can, with all his *Legerdemains*, pag. 69. only take this along with him, That by his Reflection upon that Argument, viz. That Christ hath not SO fulfilled the Law for us, as to exclude our Obedience from being requisite to our Acceptance, he implies *a Denyal of the Necessity of Obeying the Law of God to Acceptance with God*; A Doctrine suited to his Practice, contrived and continued to the Ease of Hypocrites: no wonder he struggles so hard for it; for without it nothing but Horror would surround him, though at this rate he must not alwayes expect to escape the Blow (I mean not, *assassinating* of him) a Trick that lives nearer his Complexion then mine, but that Vengeance which is the Recompence of every Soul that loveth and maketh a Lye.

With you. the People called *Anabaptists*, I leave this Section; Right us, Right your selves; Right our Profession of such an Unfair Adversary, and your selves of so Scandalous an Advocate.

---

§. II. *That* T. Hicks *has grosly Perverted our Writings.*

TO *Forge* is bad, but to *Pervert* may in a Sense be worse; since it is to mis-use true words, and by Disguise twist them to a Sense never intended, when many times that which is false is undiscernably swallowed for the sake of something that's true.

This was another Charge I exhibited against *T. Hicks*, and

and an Argument by which I proved him no *Chriſtian*. I frequently in my Book took Occaſion to detect him of this Unworthy Practice and more eſpecially by 26 Inſtances under a diſtinct Head, containing ten pages, our *Principles* in one Column, and his *Perverſions*, in another; but he ſeems dumb to the Charge. Shall I enter him mute? *that* may alter, but not excuſe the Puniſhment (*Aſſaſſinating* always excepted.) I ſhall, *Reader*, for thy ſake and the Truth's, produce ſome of them, that thoſe to whom this may come, may have ſome Account of his Carriage in his former *Dialogues*.

I. From our Belief of the Light's Sufficiency to ſave, he infers, *That all other Means are needleſs*, Dial. 1. p. 36,37. not conſidering it was not the Light's *Inſufficiency*, but man's *Weakneſs*, that occaſion'd them. He might object Inſufficiency as well againſt God, Chriſt, Spirit, Grace, &c.

II. From our making the Illumination in man to be a natural *Emanation* or Product of the divine Word which made all things, he wickedly turns it to *An Effect of God's Power*, and ſo ſayes, *we would make Beaſts and Trees*, &c. alſo divine, Ibid. p. 4.

III. From our aſſerting that the Light of Chriſt ſhineth within the Hearts of Wicked as well as Good Men, He tells People (in our Name) *that he is in the Heart of every Wicked Man, as he is in his Saints*, Gont. p. 45,46. Though through Rebellion they partake not of his Life, Power, &c.

IV.

IV. From our affirming, that God is the Teacher of his People, He infers, *That we deny all Miniſtry and Viſible Worſhip*, though they ſtand in God's Power and Spirit, 1 *Dial.* p. 42,43.

V. From our believing Chriſt to be in his People, according to expreſs Scripture, and that as ſuch he is crucified by Wicked Men, He infers, *That we deny Chriſt to be as well without as within; or that he was ever crucified in the Fleſh*, 1 Dial. p. 44. Contin. pag. 37, 40, 42.

VI. From our denying of their rigid Satisfaction, that is, that Chriſt was puniſhed by his Father for our Sin; and that Sins paſt, preſent and to come, are anſwered for: And that men may be Holy by Virtue thereof, though not new, but old Creatures, and ſo unholy in themſelves, He unworthily concludes, *That we diſown Chriſt's Death and Sufferings, as a Propitiation, that it carried away Sins paſt, and ſealed Remiſſion in his Blood to as many as believe: And that we expect to be both forgiven and accepted, not for Chriſt's ſake, nor in his Sacrifice & Righteouſneſs, but our own Works*, 1 Dial. p. 9,10. Contin. 48,49,50,51,52,53.

VII. From our pleading for a Perfection from Sin, and the Duty of growing to the Fulneſs of the Meaſure, &c. He infers, *Our Denyal of Perfection in Degrees, and our Belief of as high a Degree of Perfection in this World, as hereafter*, Dial. 1. pag. 48,49,50, 51.

VIII.

VIII. Becauſe we ſay, that ſuch Works as are wrought by the Holy Spirit in us, are neceſſary to Eternal Life, and may in a ſenſe be ſaid to obtain it, ſince the Lord hath ſo freely offered it upon the Condition of believing and obeing, which are the Fruits of the Spirit of God in man; *T. Hicks* ſuggeſts in our Name, *That we expect to merit eternal Life by our good Works, and thoſe of our own Working, as the Spider weaves his Webb out of his own Bowels*, Dial. *pag.* 38. Contin. *pag.* 51, 52.

IX. Becauſe we ſay, All Spiritual Liberty ſtands in God's Power (that redeems from *Sathan*'s Snares) He inferreth, *That who are not of our Way, ſhould have no Liberty*, Cont. *pag.* 85.

X. Becauſe we ſay, The Scriptures are not the great Goſpel-*Rule*, but the *Spirit*; The Diſpenſation of the Spirit being that of the Goſpel more peculiarly; and that without it we cannot underſtand, or ſavingly believe any thing declared of in the Scripture, and therefore that it is our Rule for believing the Scriptures themſelves; He baſely ſuggeſts, *That the* Quakers *caſt off all Precepts in the Scriptures; and ſo will not bring their Cheats and Impoſtures to the Teſt thereof, counting them of no more Authority then* Eſop's *Fables*, Dial. 1. *p.* 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36. Contin. *Epiſt. to the Reader*. Behold your *Anabaptiſt-Preacher*!

XI. From our preaching men to a loſt God and Chriſt, that is, to God and Chriſt whom they have loſt Fellowſhip with, He perverts it to our believing, *That God*

God and Christ were in a lost or undone Condition, Cont. p. 49.

XII. From our asserting, that what was a Command to any Servant of God in old time, is not so to us, because so to them, that is, such as *Moses*'s going to *Pharoah*, the Performance of *Types*, *Shadows* and *Figures* appointed for a Season, and to pass off, unless requir'd by the same Spirit anew, He falsly infers, *That those Moral and Eternal Precepts, Thou shalt have no other God but me, Thou shalt not Murder, Commit Adultery, Steal, Bare False Witness, &c. are not binding upon us, but that we give our selves the Liberty of such horrid Principles, as the contrary to those Principles, and are therefore inconsistent with Government*, Contin. pag. 59, 60. Who would have expected this from a profest *Baptist* and Preacher too?

XIII. From our denying the Resurrection of the natural and corruptible Body, leaving it with the Lord to give us a Body as pleaseth him, as 1 *Cor.* 15. 36, 37, 38. This Caviller endeavours to possess People with *our Denyal of the Resurrection of any Body to Life eternal, however spiritual or glorified*, Dial. 1. p. 56. *to* 62.

And lastly, from our asserting the Unity of God and the Soul, and Denyal of his carnal Resurrection; he concludes, *That the Soul is Part of God, and that no future Rewards or Punishments are to be expected*, Dial. 1. p. 16, 17.

These *Reader*, are some of the many Perversions this Ungodly Man is guilty of against our Principles. Is this

to

to condemn the *Quaker* out of his own Mouth, and to evince his Objections againſt him to be real Truths? Is not *Counterfeit* a Name good enough for him that has thus counterfeited a *Quaker* and a *Chriſtian* too? Will this bring Honour to his Brethren? Or can it be conſiſtent with their Credit, to encourage ſuch baſe Attempts, when but a midling *Heathen* would have abhorred to have been the Actor of half that Injury *T. H.* hath not only committed, but continues in, and boaſts of.

And that he has betaken himſelf to no better Refuge from the Purſuit of our Arguments, notwithſtanding the Cautions of our former Book, I ſhall in a few Inſtances make evidently appear to all that dare truſt, and will but impartially uſe their Eyes?

1. From my ſaying, That thoſe that crucified Chriſt were Admirers of the Scriptures, and pretended out of their own Law, that it was both lawful and neceſſary he ſhould be put to Death: Whereas, had they brought that Deed to the Light, the Light would have ſhown it not to have been wrought in God; which the Scriptures without the Light could not effectually do: He makes no Conſcience of inferring, *That I intimate an Inſufficiency in the Scriptures to convince the* Jews *that Murder was a Sin*, Dial. 3. p. 13. Whereas the Queſtion was not, whether Murder was a Sin; but whether the *Jews* thought *that* Murder, by the Scripture: if they did, give us an Inſtance; if they did not, then I have the End of my Alluſion, to wit, If the Scriptures are not therefore inſufficient in *T. H's* Account, becauſe the *Jews* were not convinced by them of Murder; neither ought the Light within to be reputed inſufficient, becauſe Men were not convinced of their Unbelief in Chriſt by it. I will anſwer him in ſetting down his own Words to me:

O Impious Man! ſayes he: *The Defect was not in the Scriptures, but in themſelves, in not attending what was therein delivered, wherein Murder is peremptorily forbidden.* Right; But, *O Impious Man!* ſay I, the Defect was not in the Light, but themſelves, in not attending to it, whereby Murder is alſo forbidden. How much more ſufficient now, *T. H.* is the Scripture then the Light? Vain Shuffler!

But this is not all his Perverſion; for he further infers in my Name, *That the Scriptures did rather countenance and juſtifie, then condemn them in that Fact*, Dial. 3. p. 13. Which, *Reader*, in plain Terms, is as much as to ſay, becauſe the Scriptures do not *ſo effectually* diſcover evil Conceptions as the *Light within*; therefore the Scriptures *rather countenance and juſtifie them*: Monſtrous Baſeneſs! The Truth is, were his Endeavours againſt us but well weighed of all that ſee them, there were little need of our Labour in his Diſcovery, or our own Defence. But that which aggravates his Sin, is the hard Words he gives me after all; I know not why, unleſs to cover his own Guilt, or make his credulous Reader think me as hateful as he would have me.

2. The ſecond Perverſion I ſhall inſtance, is this: Becauſe I told him (in Anſwer to his Objection about the Light's Inſufficiency, for its not diſcovering to the *Heathen Philoſophers* how Sin came into the World) If he meant by that Diſcovery, a clear and diſtinct Account and particular Hiſtory, how *Adam* and *Eve* were beguiled by the Serpent, it was nowayes to his Purpoſe (unleſs he can prove the Knowledge of it abſolutely neceſſary to Salvation) He, according to his uſual Baſeneſs, makes me to ſay, *The Penning of that Hiſtory was to no Purpoſe*, Dial. 3. p. 41. thus interrogating of me, *Wilt thou dare*

dare to ſay, the Knowledge of this is to no Purpoſe? Why then did ſacred Penmen give ſuch full Account thereof? As if it were one and the ſame Thing for me to ſay, the Penning of that Hiſtory is to *No* Purpoſe, and to ſay, *It is not to* T. Hicks's *Purpoſe.* Is this the Way to prove the *Quaker* no *Chriſtian*? But ſince this full Account is made ſuch a great Inſtance by *T. H* for the Sufficiency of the Scripture, and Inſufficiency of the Light, let him tell me, *What Paradiſe* Adam *was put in; and where it was? What was that Serpent that tempted* Eve; *a fallen Spirit, or a Beaſt of the Field? And what was that Fruit and Tree God forbad, and the Serpent tempted the Woman to eat of? And what was the Voice* Adam *heard in the Garden? What were thoſe Fig-Leaves he covered himſelf with hall? And what was that Death that he dyed? And what were thoſe Cherubims and the flaming Sword and the Tree of Life, all mentioned in that Hiſtory?* If he takes the Account *Literally*, let him ſay ſo; but let him take this with him, that then *Adam* bodily dyed, before he begot his Sons and Daughters; and the Hiſtory gives us no Account of his corporal Reſurrection: But if he take the Account in whole or in Part *myſtically*, then how is it full, clear and diſtinct, not diſtinguiſhing Literal & Natural from Myſtical and Spiritual Things? Is this the Way to prove the Inſufficiency of the Light within, that ſends all People to the Light within for a ſufficient Account, which ſayes Dr. *Henry Moor* of *Cambridge, ſpoke in and reproved* Adam *for his Lapſe from God*, Philoſoph. Cab. p. 27.

However it be, this lies at *T H*'s Door, that becauſe I ſaid, his Inſtance of *Moſes*'s Writing *was nothing to his Purpoſe*, he makes me to conclude, *They were writ*

to no Purpoſe. If he loved his Soul, he would hate theſe Courſes, that need no Aggravation, their own Infamy is enough.

3. Again, from my acknowledging that the Scripture furniſheth me with the Knowledge of Chriſt's viſible Tranſactions; he infers thus, *which is as if thou ſhouldſt ſay, God manifeſted in the Fleſh could not have been known by thee, were it not revealed in the Scriptures, intimating, thou couldſt NEVER have known it, but by the meer Light in thee,* Dial. 3. p. 44, 48.

Which intimates, that *Thomas Hicks* is an arrant *Perverter* of my Senſe. Is there no Difference between ſaying, I was informed of a certain Paſſage by *A. B.* and ſaying, *It was impoſſible I ſhould have known it any other Way then by* A. B. But why all this wreſting? Is it to conclude, *therefore the Light within is inſufficient?* which may as well be inferred againſt God, Chriſt and the Holy Spirit; for he makes me to exclude all other Wayes of Diſcovery, then what is made by Scripture. If an Account be wanting, the Light of Chriſt is as ſufficient now, as it was in the Time of *Moſes* and the *Prophets*, who wrot both of Things paſt and to come: But a Relation being with us, the Light of Chriſt doth nothing unneceſſarily. But 'tis like *T. H.* degenerates not from his Anceſtors; he can cry, *Come down and ſave thy ſelf, &c.*

4. From our aſſerting the Works of the Spirit in us neceſſary to our compleat Juſtification or Acceptance with God, he inſinuates, *Our making thoſe Works the meritorious Cauſe of our Salvation,* Dial. 3. p. 69. which is manifeſtly denyed and rejected by me, in my Anſwer, p. 72, 73, 82, 83, 86. which he no more regards, then

If

if it never were: The Trick of an unfair and ſhuffling Adverſary.

5. From my aſſerting the Neceſſity of an inward Work of Righteouſneſs, by the Power of Chriſt in theſe Words of the Apoſtles to the *Galatians*, Let every Man prove his own Work, & then ſhall he have Rejoycing in himſelf, and not in another: He, to make his Ends upon me, infers, *That the Doctrine of Chriſt dying for Sinners, hath nothing in it, as the Ground of our Rejoycing: For our Rejoycing muſt be in our ſelves, not in another*, Dial. 3. p. 69, 70.

That, *Reader*, which aggravates this wretched Conſequence by him, charged upon me, is firſt, that he ſayes, it is *plainly deducible*, which is ſo plain a Wreſt; And next, that they are the Apoſtle's Words, and not mine, of which he makes ſo ill an Uſe.

Is this to make the Scripture his Rule, that is ſo unruly in his Abuſe of them? I am ſure, a lying and an abuſive Spirit has been his Rule throughout his three *Dialogues*, which God rebuke.

6. The ſixth Perverſion is as follows: Being formerly aſſaulted by *T. Hicks*, Cont. p. 50. for having ſaid in a Book entituled, *The Serious Apology*, &c. p. 148. *That Juſtification by a Righteouſneſs wholy without us, is a Doctrine of Divels*; I undertook my Defence, and performed it in my Anſwer to his other *Dialogues*, from p. 68. to p. 98. I diſtinguiſhed upon the Word *Juſtification*, firſt as it might be taken *barely for the Remiſſion of Sins, or the acquitting Men of the Guilt and Puniſhment due to Sin, which was the free Love and Mercy of God upon Repentance (declared in Chriſt's Death, as a Propitiation for the Sins of the whole World) and therefore not to be merited by the beſt Works we can perform*. 2dly,

As it imported a being made inwardly juſt by the bringing in of Chriſt's Everlaſting Righteouſneſs to the Soul. To leave out this latter, and make the former only ſufficient (whereby Men are left in an unjuſt and unrighteous State) I affirmed to be a *Doctrine of Devils*. But notwithſtanding this plain and ſcriptural Diſtinction to ſatisfie *T. Hicks* (would he but be ſatisfied) what I meant by Juſtification; He is ſo unjuſt to me, as to infer in my Name, *That I account the Doctrine of Chriſt's Death in the Nature of a Sacrifice, to declare the Righteouſneſs of God, for the Remiſſion of Sins that are paſt* (becauſe tranſacted *without us*) *a Doctrine of Devils*, Dial. 3. p. 72, 73, 74.

Canſt thou, *Reader*, in earneſt think, this Man makes Conſcience of his Endeavours againſt us, who commits theſe frequent Abuſes againſt our Books, Perſons and Principles? As if becauſe I acknowledged Chriſt's Death to be in the Nature of a Sacrifice, to declare God's Righteouſneſs, in the Remiſſion of Sins that are paſt, unto them that believe, &c. to be one Part of Juſtification; & that this Tranſaction was confeſſedly, *without us*, even while we were Sinners, &c. that therefore, I ſhould call this the Doctrine of Devils, *becauſe without us*, though the Word *wholy* be not there, upon which lay the Streſs, and which was only ſaid by me of a Juſtification, that *wholy* excludes Chriſt's Righteouſneſs revealed within, to the making Man Juſt; unworthily applying that Reflection to the beginning of Juſtification, that I have ſo expreſly owned, which was made againſt a Doctrine no wayes concern'd in this true and Goſpel-Juſtification. In ſhort, If Juſtification by Chriſt's Righteouſneſs without us, be the ſame, *with being juſtified by Chriſt's Righteouſneſs* wholy *without us*; then *T. H.* is not ſo bad a man,

as

as I have repreſented him: But if there be any Difference, as undeniably there is, and a material One too; then *T. H*'s Inference and Concluſion in my Name, make a foul Perverſion.

7. The laſt Perverſion I at this time think fit to mention, is *his* laſt, both in his Epiſtle and Book, to wit, from my ſaying, upon a ſad Conſideration of his many Miſcarriages towards us, *That his Head ſhould not go down into the Grave in Peace*; he thus interprets my Words: *I muſt take them either as a Prediction, or as a Menace of ſome Miſchief, he himſelf, or ſome influenced by him intend to perpetrate upon me: The former I fear not, the latter is moſt Probable*; as if *Reader*, his not fearing a Prediction, implies my not meaning a Prediction. But why is the former not feared, *& the latter more probable*? becauſe he would render me a *Murderer*, as his following Words ſufficiently evidence. *Wherefore*, ſayes he, *I deſire all to whom this Book may come, that if at any time they hear of any Violence offered me, or that I be* ASSASSINATED, *they would remember theſe Words of* W. Penn. that my Head ſhall not go down to the Grave in Peace, *Epiſt. Book End.* Now though this miſerable Conſtruction be ridiculous with wiſe Men, and rejected of ſeveral of his own Way, and ſo unlikely a Thing in it ſelf, that I ſhould proclaim that to be my Deſign that leads to the *Gibbit*, viz. *Murder*; yet I was unwilling to paſs it by, ſince *firſt*, it rather renders him to be the Man he ſuggeſts me to be: And *ſecondly*, It aggravates the Sin of his falſe Conſtruction; becauſe to inſinuate it the better, he has left out all theſe Words going before and after, that had they been mentioned, would have detected his Malice, viz. *Though thou haſt beſtowed much Time to abuſe our Friends in general, and*

my ſelf in particular, a Stranger to thee, yet I can forgive thee: *Oh, that theſe heavy Things might not be laid to thy Charge! God will viſit for theſe Unrighteous Dealings, if thou deſiſt not.* Now, *Reader,* if I forgive, how can I *Aſſaſſinate*? and if it be God's viſiting Hand, how can it be *mine, or any influenced by me*? Again, theſe following Words were the next to thoſe by him cited, viz. *Tea the Light within will bear Witneſs to the Truth of theſe Things on thy* DYING-BED, *and then remember me.* How comes this *T. H.* to be omitted? *Dying-Beds* do not uſe to be *unnatural Deaths*; Nor will the Light within bear VVitneſs for Murder: *Was all this left out to evince, that the* Fictions *I charged upon thee, were real Truths & no Fictions; & that a* Quaker *is quite another thing then a Chriſtian*? becauſe it is his Honour to be quite another Thing then ſuch a *Chriſtian* as thou art, that is, a very *Counterfeit.*

Reader, Does not thy Soul riſe againſt theſe abominable Practices? Falſeneſs was ever hateful to Truth, and Baſeneſs to an honeſt Mind, which *T. H.* being proved thus guilty of, I muſt conclude him quite another Thing then a *Chriſtian.*

Thus have I finiſhed my Obſervations on his Perverſions, leaving them alſo with the People called *Anabaptiſts,* upon whom I cannot chuſe, but frequently call for Juſtice againſt this their unjuſt Member; concluding my Complaint in this Section, in honeſt *John Huſſe's* againſt the like Adverſaries, on the ſame Occaſion: 'Some 'of theſe Propoſitions I did write and publiſh, other 'ſome mine Enemy did feign, now adding, then dimi-'niſhing and taking away, now falſly aſcribing and im-'puting the whole Propoſition unto me.

§. III.

§. III. T. H. *proved guilty of* Lyes *and* Slanders.

Reader, In my Anſwer to his former *Dialogues*, I charg'd him with *Eighten Lyes* and *Slanders* under a diſtinct Head, *pag.* 154, 155, 156. of which I find not that he hath taken any notice, ſaving two by way of further Affirmation, but no Proof. A few I ſhall mention to his utter Shame with all men loving *Religion*.

1ſt, *That the* Quakers *owning of Chriſt Jeſus, and the Chriſt they own, are a meer myſtical Romance*, Dial. *p.* 10. Cont. *pag.* 9. A prophane Untruth!

2. *That the Light in the* Quakers *ſees no Neceſſity of a Mediator*, 1 Dial. *p.* 35. when, God knows, we feel the daily Benefit of him.

3. *That the* Quakers *account the Blood of Chriſt no more then they do the Blood of a common Thief*, Ibid. *p.* 38. An ungodly Aſperſion.

4. *That we deny his Viſible Coming and Appearance in the World*, Cont. *p.* 37. This he contradicts elſe-where.

5. *That the* Quakers *diſſemble when they tell People they own the Scriptures; and that they render them of no more Authority then* Eſop's *Fables*, Cont. *Epiſt.* Both abominable Untruths.

6. *That a* Quaker *ſhould ſay, The Thing that troubles thee is thy Puzling thy ſelf in that Book the* Bible, *Thou wilt never be ſetled till thou* throw *that Book away*, Cont. *pag.* 76. An arrant Slander.

7. *That a* Quaker *ſhould ſay to one* J Nobbs; *What doeſt thou tell me of the Scriptures, They are no more to me then an* OLD AIMANAK [whereas *J. Nobbs*, if he be alive,

alive, and have but a little more Honeſty then *T. H* can't but confeſs that he was no *Quaker*; nor that there was one ſo call'd in that Country, when any thing like thoſe words were ſpoken] As *T. Holbrow*, the Perſon charg'd by *J. N.* related it to me the laſt Summer, *Dial.*

8. *That the* Quakers *appoint their Miniſters to ſpeak in ſuch a Place, and at ſuch a Time: And they go to Meetings only to* DECOY, TRAPAN & INVIEGLE, Cont. *pag.* 66.

9. *That a Woman-*Quaker *ſhould bid her Husband take another Woman*, Ibid. *pag.* 63.

10. *That the Motions of God's Spirit are pretended by* Quakers, *at leaſt one of them, to* REFUSE *juſt Debts*, Cont. *pag.* 69.

What Man that makes Conſcience of *Lying*, would have told ſo many groſs *Untruths*; and that cared for his own Reputation, would have paſs'd over their Proof in ſuch Silence?

Either he thinks it no Sin to render men *Hereticks* & *Knaves* at Pleaſure; or that there is no Obligation upon him to maintain his foul Imputations. But let ſee how much better he is grown ſince his ſecond *Dialogue*.

1. The firſt *Great Lye* he tells in his *New Book*, is the very firſt Sentence that is writ in it, viz. *The* Quaker *Condemned out of his own Mouth*: For it is *His* foul Mouth that hath both Accuſed and Condemn'd him; as we have already prov'd, and ſhall yet have further occaſion to do.

2. His ſecond *Untruth* is in the fourth Page of his Epiſtle, viz. *That there was a Perſon eſteem'd by the* Quakers *a Friend, of whom* W. Penn *gave this Character, That he might be truſted with one's Life (notwithſtanding* W. Penn's *Infallible Judgment) counterfeited*

like

(*like an Ungrateful and Unworthy Wretch*) W. Penn's *Hand, took up a conſiderable Sum of Money in his Name* (*pretending for his uſe*) *which* W. Penn *in a little time found* (*though to his Coſt*) *to be a meer Cheat.*

Reader, He hath put the *Quaker* in this man's Livery, that he might have the fairer Plea for abuſing him. *Ungrateful and Unworthy Wretch*, are Words not ſo much flung at the Fact or the Man, as the *Quaker*: For, were it the Temper of *Thomas Hicks* to be grateful and worthy to them that obliege him, he would never be Injurious to them, that never hurt him. But, be that as it will, I have three things to ſay to *T. Hicks*: 1*ſt*, That this Man was never a *Quaker*, unleſs ſuch as ſometimes come to *T. Hicks*'s Meeting are to be reputed *Anabaptiſts*, having never come under any of thoſe external Significations, by which they are differ'd from other People; and I think I ought to be believ'd before *T. H.* that knew him, and perhaps he never ſaw him. 2*dly*, If he were an *Unworthy Wretch* for counterfeiting my Hand in *Money matters*; how much more *Unworthy a Wretch* is T. Hicks *who hath counterfeited the Faith, Doctrine and Practice of a great Body of People to the rendering them Infamous with all men*, were that Work as Really Believed, as it was Enviouſly Contrived. 3*dly*, But for all my *Infallible Judgment*, I was cheated, ſayes *T. H.* How plentiful, *Reader*, are the Inſtances *T. H.* gives us, to detect him: For beſides the Baſeneſs of his *Taunt*, he inferreth from our Aſſerting an *Infallibility in the Principle*, our arrogating an Infallibility to all our *Perſons*, as well in Civil as Religious Concerns, whether we obey it, or no. But to turn it back upon himſelf: Have no *Anabaptiſts* been cheated, notwithſtanding they pretend the *Scriptures* to be their *Infal*

libl

lible Rule? If they have, ſhall I make one of *T. H*'s Concluſions? viz. *That they are Infallible, becauſe they have an Infallible Rule; Or that the Rule is Fallible, becauſe they are Fallible themſelves*? Or in Caſe of being cheated, ſhould we tauntingly ſay, *Where is your Infallible Judgment, becauſe you ſay, You have an infallible Rule?*

3. I charge him with ſlandering our Friends, in ſaying, *That when it hath been demonſtrated to them* wherein (he thinks) I have erred, *What doſt thou tell us of* W. Penn; *He is an Heady, Raſh Youngman, we take no notice what he ſaith---Yet acquaint them with the like Extravagancies in the Writings of the former*, G.F. *&c. They will either peremptorily deny them ſo written, or elſe tell us, We underſtand not their Meaning*, Epiſt. *pag.* 5. This let him prove if he can.

4. *That the* Quakers *excuſe ſome of of their Villanies, by Pretences to the Innocent Life.* This we eſteem an abominable Falſhood, 3 *Dial.* Epiſt.

5. The next Slander is, *That the* Quakers *warn their Proſelytes againſt reading their Adverſaries Books, leſt their Wickedneß ſhould be detected*, p. 76. A very Falſhood.

6. *That* W. Penn *by the Senſe of the Eternal Spirit doth declare, that* Curſing, Railing *and* Lying *were the only fit Anſwers to be given to the Prieſts trapanning Queſtions*, pag. 10, 80, 81, 82. Oh Ungodly Slanderer! The Lord rebuke thy foul Spirit

7. *That the* Quakers *have diſcovered themſelves to be no other then the Spawn of that wicked Brood, the* Ranters, *having lick'd up their Vomit*, pag. 80. What ſay the *Baptiſts* to this? It is known, none ſo oppoſed them.

8. *The* Quakers *ſay, They witneſs Innocent and Sober Enquirers after their Faith and Religion to be Beaſts, Sots, in the Sorcery and Witchcraft*, pag. 85. Which manifeſt

niſeſt Slander I ſuppoſe, proceeds from certain Names, *Edw. Burrough* gave to a Prieſt that by ſubtil Queries endeavoured to trapan ſome of our Friends, as they of old, our Lord & Maſter, under the cenſure of *Blaſphemy*, and as was attempted upon ſome about that very time: So that he was an *Innocent* and *Sober Enquirer*, by the ſame Figure that *T. Hicks* hath been an *Innocent and Sober Dialoguer*, who firſt invents Lyes, and then kicks them up and down for our Principles and Practices.

9. Another notorious *Falſhood* committed by *T. H.* againſt us, is in *pag.* 88. to wit, *That ſome Overtures have of late been offered to the* Quakers, *in order to a publick Meeting, to debate the chief Things in Difference betwixt them and others; which the* Quakers *refuſed, under Pretence of being cautious not to run themſelves voluntarily into Jeopardies, and therefore think it their beſt Way to Rail at their Adverſaries.* It is to be hoped *T. H.* by this time hath ſufficiently ſhewed and vented his Falſehoods and Slanders by the Frequency of them; and that for the future they will leſs need our Animadverſion. That this is one, and a *Great One* too, take what follows.

W. Hayworth, an Empty, but Hot-headed *Preacher* among the *Profeſſors* at *Hartford*, often making a kind of Challenge to ſome of our Friends to meet with any of their Teachers; and being anſwered that they would not refuſe him a Meeting, he proceeded thereon, and propoſed *Ware* for the Place; againſt which the Scruple was made, and not about a Meeting, as *T. H.* falſly relates: This our Friends Anſwers to *W. Hayworth* prove. In *Th. Prior*'s firſt Anſwer to *W. H.* it is ſaid, *I perceive they* (the Quakers) *are not intended to refuſe thee a Meeting, at a convenient Time and Place agreed on by both Parties; and it is expected and intended, the Book authorized*

thorized by thee, ſtyl'd, The Quaker Converted, *be th. Subject of the Diſpute.* And in the ſecond Paper to *W. Hayworth,* it is propoſed, *That the Meeting be at* Theobald's; *and that after the ſaid Book be fully diſcourſed, if he had not Diſputing enough, ſuch other Queſtions as tend to Edification be propounded, and a further time taken to diſcourſe them*: But he would nowayes conſent that his *Book* ſhould be the Subject; ſaying in his Letter, *That to undertake it would narrow the Debate.*

Judge now *Reader,* who evaded the *Meeting*; and if *T. Hicks* hath not falſly accuſed the *Quaker* with refuſing it: yet doth he Rant, Revile & add Lye unto Lye in that very Page where he told this, that he might make the moſt of his fancied Advantage againſt us, to our Diſgrace, and his own Tryumph. But he ſhall fail in his Endeavours, and God will advocate our Cauſe among Men, againſt theſe foul and provoking Imputations. One *Slander* more, and we end this Section.

10. *That the Tendency of all the* Quakers *Reaſoning about inſtituted* Religion, *is to* DEBAUCH MANKIND, *to teach them how to live in Rebellion againſt God. Their* Religion *is a meer Cheat, calculated only to the Service of the* Devil *and their own Luſts, and inconſiſtent with Government,* Dial. 1. *pag.* 62. Dial. 3. *p.* 65.

Here is a great deal in a little; all at once: This ſhews what the Man would be at, and makes good what elſewhere he ſaith, *That we are inconſiſtent with Government,* Cont. *pag.* 69. The Conſequence is plain; A *New-England* Antidote, to rid *Old-England* of the *Epidemical* Diſeaſe of *Quakeriſm*: For it is a *Maxim* in Law, *That whoſoever is inconſiſtent with Government, deſerves not the Protection of Government.*

But that this Language ſhould drop from the Pen of

an

an *Anabaptiſt* to a *Quaker*, is juſtly ſurprizing; ſince a Multitude of his Profeſſion ſtand charg'd on record with ſo many groſs Immoralities, erroneous Doctrines, and rebellious Practices, as have rendred them and their Profeſſion, the Suſpicion of the Weak, the Abhorrence of the Multitude and at beſt the Diſlike of many good men: But though *T. H.* hath invented Crimes to blacken us, I ſhall not ſo much, as recriminate the People that go under that Name, having abundance more of Charity for them then the ſofteſt Paſſage in *T. H's Dialogue* can afford us. I am well ſatisfied, that I have thus far honeſtly repreſented him in his Inventions, Perverſions, Slanders and Aggravations, ſo inconſiſtent with the Spirit, Language and Carriage of a true *Chriſtian*; and therefore his Pretence of being ſuch, renders him but the greater COUNTERFEIT.

---

§. IV. *That* T. Hicks, *is guilty of Plain* Contradictions.

IT is inconſiſtent with the Credit of any man that writes, to contradict himſelf: But for one who pretends himſelf a *Chriſtian*, ſo to do, and that in Matters of Religion, is ſhamefully to make void his own Pretences. That *T. Hicks* is the man, I produced ſeveral in my Anſwer to his former *Dialogues*; But they were equally diſregarded with the reſt, not having ſo much as attempted the reconciling of them.

I will briefly repeat ſome of them, and add more out of all three *Dialogues*.

I. Contradiction. Firſt, I, T. Hicks, *do acknowledged*,

ledge, that the Light within checketh for many Evils, and excites to many good things; and that I ought to shun those Evils, and do that Good, 1 Dial. p. 8. Yet in direct Contradiction he dares to tell us, *That this Light in us directing to its best Actions, swelleth men but with proud Conceits; and that it doth deceive and mis-guide such as follow it,* 1 Dial. p. 3, 37, 38.

2 Contr. *I,* Thomas Hicks *do and must bear Witness against thy Erroneous Opinion, if true to the Light in me,* Dial. p. 8. *I am to do what the Light in my self directs me, and herein is my Comfort,* p. 91. *I grant it ought to be obeyed,* p. 7.—Yet in direct Contradiction, and to unsay this, he tells us, *That the Light is uncertain; in one man it teacheth one thing, and in another the directly contrary, so that,* saith he, *there can be no Certainty of Truth or Error, Sin or Duty by this,* Dial. p. 42.

3 Contr. Again, *T. Hicks* sayes, *That it is no Disparagement to the Light within, to say, That God doth make any Thing more known of his Will, then is or can be known by it; For it is but to say, that* EACH DEGREE *of Light is serviceable to its End,* 1 Dial. p. 36.—Yet in direct Contradiction to, and Undervalue of this, he sayes within two Pages after, *The Improvement of the Light within subverts the Covenant of Grace, the only Way God hath revealed for Salvation; and that it directly Opposeth it self to the Ends of the Covenant, and ought to be rejected,* p. 38.

My *Animadversion* contracted upon these Contradictions I will give: If this be to argue safely, prudently and like a Disputant, I am greatly mistaken; sure I am, there is nothing of Truth or *Christianity* in such Confusion: *For that a Man should be oblieged to obey a*

Light

Light that doth miſ-guide, or that T. Hicks *ſhould talk of acting according to the* Light *in him, making his Appeal to it in others; and yet ſay, that it may deceive, and oppoſe the very Ends of the Covenant of Grace, is with me the Top of all Impudence and Self-Contradiction.*

All this, *Reader*, he paſs'd with his uſual Silence.

How concern'd he was to conſider it, I ſhall leave with thee to judge, having hereby ſo manifeſtly forfeited his Reputation, both as a *Chriſtian* and *a Diſputant*. But I will not leave him here; I ſhall greaten his Score ere we part, and yet evidence, that he hath ſaid little againſt us, wherein he hath not ſaid a great deal in Contradiction to himſelf.

Contr. I. *I*, T. Hicks, *appeal to the Light in thee*, Steph. Criſp, *whether this be not an inſufficient Proof; for I grant the Light ought to be obeyed; It checks for Evil, and excites to good things*, Dial. 1. *pag.* 7, 8.

Yet in *Contradiction* to this, hear what he ſayes:

I deny not a Light to be in every man; for the Underſtanding and Conſcience being Parts of the Reaſonable Soul, theſe do remain ſtill in the Worſt of Men, though the RECTITUDE BE LOST, Dial. 1. *pag.* 32.

Obſerv. Is it not Madneſs in *T. Hicks* to appeal to a *Light* that hath loſt its *Rectitude* (that is *Reader*, which through Depravity is become *Darkneſs*) for an Evidence about matters of the greateſt concern in *Religion*? Can ſuch a Light check for Evil, and excite to Good, that *T. H.* ſayes, hath loſt its *Rectitude*? And is it a *Crooked* and *Depraved Light* that he grants, is to be obeyed and followed? Is this man fit to reprove the *Quakers* for turning men to a *ſufficient* Light, who himſelf confeſſedly follows a *Crooked* & *Depraved Light*? No Wonder

der if he cannot see the Truth and Streightness of our *Light*, who judgeth of it by a Light that hath lost its *Rectitude*: For, saith he, *I do and must bear witness against thy Opinion of the Sufficiency of the Light in every man, if I be true to the Light in me, that hath lost its Rectitude*, 1 Dial. *pag.* 8, 32.

Contr. II. *It will be our Wisdom, yea our Duty (also) to attend to the Light within*, 1 Dial. *pag.* 13. as the Place imports.

Yet in direct *Contradiction* he sayes *pag.* 38.

What intollerable Pride and Arrogancy have you Quakers *arrived to, and all this in following the Conduct of the Light within?*

What sayest thou to this, *Reader?* Is this Man like to make the *Quaker No Christian?* Is it not a Shame for those call'd *Anabaptists* to suffer this man as well in his manifest Weakness, as great *Dishonesty* to manage the Controversie against us?

Contr. III. *That which any of you* Quakers *have said of the Light within, hath been no more then what the Apostle speaks of the Man of Sin. And what may as well prove* Mahomet *to be the True Christ, as the Light in you.* Again, *If thou sayest that the Light in every man is Christ, I charge it with Blasphemy*, 1 Dial. pag 3, 11, 12.

Yet in direct Contradiction T. H. saith:

How could you (Quakers) *call the Light within Christ, if some Scriptures had not mentioned Christ in you, and that he is the the Light and Life of men*, 1 Dialog. pag. 22.

Observe. Does *Joh.* 1. 4, 9. chap. 14. 20. 2 *Cor.* 4, 6. chap.

chap. 13. 5. *Gal.* 1. 16. which we are wont to offer as well prove the Man of Sin, *&* *Mahomet*, to be Christ as the *Light* which T. H. acknowledgeth to check for Evil, to excite to Good things; and confesseth, as before, *That the Scriptures have given us to call the Light within Christ, and Christ the Life and Light of men?* Wer't thou aware of these things, T. H. when thou wroteſt them? Art thou fit to accuſe me of *Inadvertency*, that committeſt it thy ſelf. I will not ſay that any of thy Friends, being charg'd with thy Follies, replied, *What doeſt thou tell us of T. Hicks? He is a Heady, Raſh Man, we take no notice what he ſaith*: But that thou haſt prov'd thy ſelf Raſh and Heady, and that they ought to take no further notice of thee then to check thee, thy wretched Management of the Controverſy againſt us, ſufficiently proveth: But let us proceed.

IV. Contr. *You* Quakers, *ſince you have reprobated the Scriptures from being your Rule, and given up your ſelves to the immediate Motions and Government of the Light within, have arrived to this Degree of Wickedneſs, to deny Jeſus Chriſt to be a diſtinct Perſon without you,* 3 Dial. *pag.* 15, 16.

Yet in plain *Contradiction* he ſayes, *That every Man hath a Light within him, is not denyed; and that it ought to be obeyed is granted,* Ibid. *pag.* 8.

Obſerv. The Conſequence, *Reader*, which is this, *That Men ought to obey that Light, the Government of which leads to deny Jeſus Chriſt,* &c. *and to perſiſt in a Reprobation of the Scriptures.* Is this Doctrine like to *Chriſtian* the Anabaptiſt, and *Unchriſtian* the Quaker?

Contr. V. *Verily, I much doubt, that you believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and that as concerning the Flesh he was put to Death at* Jerusalem, 1 Dial. *pag.* 43, 44.

Again, *The* Quaker *denies That Christ was ever Visible to Wicked men; and consequently that Person, call'd in the Scripture by this Name, who conversed in the World and suffered Death openly and visibly at* Jerusalem, *to be the Christ; So that a Personal Coming in any respect is manifestly denyed by you,* Contin. *pag.* 37, 45.

Yet to un-say and contradict all this, he says, *I never charg'd you* Quakers *for denying that bodily Appearance,* 3 Dial. *p.* 26. *I no where accuse you for denying Christ's Bodily Appearance,* Ibid. *pag.* 33. *Ye have confessed to* Christ's *Bodily Appearance,* Ibid. *pag.* 31. Which is as much as to say,

Observ. The *Quakers* do own Christ's Visible Appearance; The *Quakers* do not own Christ's Visible Appearance: yet I doubt whether they own Christ's Visible Appearance or no. Is this Man fit to write Controversie that is of three or four Minds in the writing it? The End of all this Confusion will be, not our Confutation, but Vindication in the minds of all impartial Men.

VI. Contr. His sixth Contradiction is this: *That the Religion of the* Quakers *is a Cheat, calculated only to the Service of the* Devil *& their own Lusts,* 1 Dial. *p.* 62. yet confesseth to us, *That every man is inlightned, that this Light checks for Evil, and exciteth to Good; That it ought to be obeyed,* Dial. 1. *pag.* 7, 8. Dial. 3. *pag.* 8. *And that this is the* Quakers *first and grand Principle,* Dial. 1. *pag.* 6.

Observ.

Obſerv. Now, *Reader*, how our Religion can be *calculated* to the Service of the *Devil*, and our own Luſts; & yet the firſt & grand Principle of that *Religion* be unconcern'd in that Helliſh Service, is more then I can tell.

The plain *Engliſh* of his groſs Contradiction is this: *That the Light within, which checks for Evil, and excites to Good, and ought to be tended upon and obeyed, is the firſt and grand Principle of that Religion, which is calculated to the Service of the* Devil, *and their Luſts that receive it.* For which deteſtable *Blaſphemy*, with more Reaſon may I uſe *T. H's* Exclamation, *Bluſh O Heaven! and be aſoniſht O Earth! Was ever ſuch a thing as this heard of before?* I muſt tell the People call'd *Anabaptiſts*, that the Attempts of *T. Hicks* will prove as great a Reproach to their Profeſſion, and bring the Endeavours of our *Adverſaries* into as utter Abhorrence with all honeſt-minded People, as any Oppoſition ever made againſt us.

Contr. VII. The ſeventh Contradiction, and the laſt I ſhall here mention, is very well worth the notice of my *Reader*; ſince it doth at once invalidate his whole Enterpriſe with Perſons of Underſtanding: And that is this.

A Dialogue between a Chriſtian *and a* Quaker, *wherein are faithfully repreſented ſome of the chief & moſt concerning Opinions of the* Quakers, 1 Dial. Title-page. Again, *A further Account of their perilous Errors, clearly and plainly repreſented*, Contin. Title-page. Again, *The Things objected againſt the* Quakers *in the former* Dialogues *are fully clear'd & evinced*, 3 Dial. Title-pag. Yet as a man infatuated with a Spirit of *Contradiction*, thus gives the Lye to his three *Title-Pages*, and in them to his *Three Dialogues*.

The

The Doctrines delivered (by the Quakers) *are such, as neither themselves, nor any for them can give us a distinct and intelligible Account of: And that the Tendency of all their Writings and Declarings, doth but lead People into the Thicket of Absurd, Inexplicable and Unintelligible Dotages,* Contin. Epist. p. 3.

Observ. Now, *Reader*, if no man can understand them, how can *T. Hicks* represent and evince them? Are they inexplicable by every Body, and yet explicated by him? Be they unintelligible to all People, and yet not only pretended to be understood by him, but by him made intelligible to others? How can he with Honesty or Sense pretend to give an Account of our Doctrines to the World, who confesseth not only that he has not, *but he cannot have from us or any other a distinct and intelligible Account of them*? Has he not then shot his Bow at Random? Is this the way to evince and confute them? Never, certainly *Reader*, did any man, thought to be in his Wits, give greater Ground for People to believe him out of them: We have no Cause to fear what a Thousand such *Adversaries* can do against us, who thus manifestly help us against themselves, and fall by their own Weapons: Which leads me to conclude this part of this Discourse; and that I shall do in this Argument:

He that pretends to be a Christian, *and yet commits* Forgery, *useth* Perversion, *tells* Lyes, *publisheth* Slanders, *and in his Endeavours* contradicts himself, *and that* materially, *must be a* Counterfeit, *and no* Christian: *But such a Man we have evidently prov'd* Thomas Hicks *to be*; Therefore, *I think I may be held excusable in concluding that* Tho. Hicks *is a* Counterfeit, *and no* Christian.

THE

THE REAL QUAKER JUSTIFIED,

In a *Defence* of the *Doctrines* held by him, againſt the *Mean Sophiſtry* and *Shuffling Oppoſition* of *Tho. Hicks* the COUNTERFEIT.

§. I. *Of the* Light *within.*

THough it matters not much what ſo Ill a man ſayes of any *Religion*, yet leſt ſome ſhould be ſo weak as to conclude from our Silence, our Doctrines indefenſible; and that in having the laſt Word, he has the beſt Cauſe. I ſhall briefly conſider his Oppoſition.

Counterfeit. *I do ſay, that the* Quakers *affirm the Light in every man to be God: And* W. Penn *asks*, Who of us did ever ſay, that the Light within is the whole entire God? Reaſ. againſt Rail. p. 7. *when I no where expreſs thoſe words*, 3 Dial. p. 4.

Quaker. Nor do I, *T. H.* in the manner delivered, nor to any ſuch Charge, as thou now makeſt them to

anſwer: What I ſaid, with the Ground of it, was this: *G. W.* inferring from Joh. 1. 4. *That if the Life was of the Divine Being, the Light muſt be the ſame*; (which was againſt T. H's calling it an Effect) *for as is the Cauſe, the Effect muſt be* * thou madeſt this unreaſonable Concluſion, *that not only the Light within, but every Creature, as* Beaſts *and* Trees *are* good, *becauſe the Effects of God's Power and Wiſdom.* I then charged thee with inſinuating, that every Meaſure of Light in man is whole God: So that thy not *expreſſing* thoſe words will not acquit thee from not *inſinuating* them; ſince thou doſt inſinuate upon what *G. W.* ſaid, not only every meaſure of Light, but every *Tree* and every *Beaſt*, becauſe an Effect of his Power, to be *God.*

* Which was only admitted with reſpect to its Illumination or Meaſure of its Appearance in man; It was never *G. W's* Principle or Words, that the Life which is the Light of men, Joh. 1 4. is but in it ſelf a meer Effect, for he owns it in its own Being to be no other then God himſelf, and values not the Counterfeit's Quarrel.

C. *Thou ſayeſt the Light within is not a* potential, *but a* natural *Effect, which thou illuſtrateſt thus*; Men are the natural Off-ſpring and Product of men &c. *Though this be true, yet a Son is a diſtinct Perſon from his Father: Is the Light within ſuch an Effect? Is it another God?* ibid. p. 5.

Q. I will anſwer thee in the Language of thy own Creed: The Son of God is the natural Off-ſpring of God, *is he therefore another God?* The holy Ghoſt proceeds from the Father and the Son, *is he therefore another God?* Here is *Off-ſpring* and *Production*; what ſayſt thou *T. H.* to this?

C. *If the Light within be a* natural *Effect, then*

it is a neceſſary Effect, and that from Eternity: But were Men from Eternity, in whom God had thus naturally ſhined? if not, how is the Light within a natural Effect? It is in vain to pretend to Infallibility, whilſt thou talkeſt thus idly, Ibid.

Q. Both thy ſilly Sophiſtry and Reflection are too weak for the Buſineſs. If the Light within had taken its Beginning with Men, as thou aſſerts, *Dial.* 1. *p.* 32. It were a good Conſequence, *That the Light were not Eternal, and therefore not God*; or if the Light had neceſſarily been within from Eternity, that Men were from Eternity: But that Men were from Eternity, becauſe the Light which ſhines in Men was from Eternity, is to ſay, the Word, as manifeſted in the Fleſh, was from Eternity, *becauſe the Word was from Eternity*, or that *Immanuel*, God with men, was not from Eternity, *becauſe he was not with Men, nor Men with him from Eternity.* In ſhort, thy *Sophiſtry* playes upon the Word *within*; we ſpeak of the Eternity of the Light's Nature, and thou turneſt it to an Eternity of Manifeſtation; as if becauſe we ſay the Light within is Eternal, that therefore it muſt needs have been *Eternally within.* This is not to act the *Chriſtian*, but play the *Jew* againſt the Son of God. For the Term *Effect*, it is variouſly ſpoken and taken among Men: The Light of the Sun is called an Effect of the Sun and yet the Light of the Sun, *is not another Sun.* Howbeit, the Scripture holds forth the the Life of the Word to be the Light of Men; Conſequently, *The Life and Light are one.*

C. Though thou wilt not affirm every Meaſure of the Light within to be the Eternal Being; yet thou wilt not deny, but that it is God. This clears me from Forgery.

Q. Thy ſaying ſo, makes thee but the more guilty, becauſe

becauſe the Paſſage thou pretendeſt to anſwer, has no ſuch Charge in it; beſides, thou haſt perverted my words as thy ſelf haſt given them, viz. 'Though every Mea-'ſure of Light diſtinctly is not that entire Eternal Being, 'yet we are bold to aſſert, that it is no other then *God*, '*the Fulneſs of all Light*, who ſearcheth the Heart, '&c. that doth ſhine into the inward Parts of Man, 'and doth convince, reprove,&c. Theſe latter Words were omitted by thee, on Purpoſe to make the Word *God*, relate to the *Meaſure* of Light, which is joyned by me to the *Fulneſs*. But this is frequent with thee; proceed.

C. *Either the Light within, in the leaſt Meaſure, is God, a Creature, or nothing: Thou wilt not ſay it is the entire God; thou dareſt not ſay it is a Creature; it muſt then be nothing: Might not thy Time and Abilities have been better improved, then in contending for that, which is neither God nor a Creature.*

Q. This Reflection as well reaches thee for contending againſt nothing, as me in contending for nothing: But (*Argumentum ad hominem*) conſider this; either the Spirit in the leaſt Meaſure of it is God, a Creature or nothing: I ſuppoſe *T. H.* will not ſay, that in the leaſt Meaſure it is the *entire God*; *T. H.* dares not ſay it is a *Creature*; ſhall *W. P.* then ſay in *T. Hick*'s Name, it muſt be *nothing*? Thus through Inadvertency, do Men intangle themſelves in their own Net; we ſpeak of a Meaſure of the Light and Spirit of God in Man, *T. H.* preſently prophanely takes God into Parts and Pieces, as pag. 4, 5, 6. and then charges it upon us, as the Conſequence of our Doctrine: Are not Meaſures and Degrees Scripture-Terms? Does it ſtrike at God's *Immenſity*, becauſe he meaſures forth himſelf, in his inward Diſ-

Diſcoveries, according to Man's Capacity; It is called *Meaſure*, with Reſpect to Man, and not that God is diviſible.

But the Truth is T. H. Thou haſt made it thy Buſineſs not ſoberly to argue, but vainly to quibble, manifeſtly aiming to take frothy Minds: A ſmall Share of ſuch *Sophiſtry* might eaſily obſcure the cleareſt Truths, and ſeem to lead in Triumph the ſtrongeſt Arguments given in its Defence; but the beſt of it is, ſuch Attempts are ſhort-liv'd, and ſo are thine? not, I promiſe thee, that I intend to have thee *aſſaſſinated*. But let us hear what further thou haſt to ſay upon this Paſſage.

C. *For the other Part of thy Diſcourſe, viz.* That God ſearcheth the Heart, *who denies it? But what is this to the main Point? Becauſe God ſearcheth the Heart; is therefore the* Common Light *in every Man God? Surely, no Man, except under the Power of Deluſion would thus reaſon*, p. 6.

Q. The Word *Common* is neither ours, nor the Scriptures, yet if that be the main point, it will not be hard to prove, provided, by *Common*, thou meaneſt that which ſhines in all Men; for if God be the Searcher of all men's Hearts, & he that ſhows unto man his Thoughts (as we muſt believe, till T. H. can groundedly aſſign us ſome other more common Searcher of the Heart, &c. then God) and if God doth this, *as he is Light, who is Light*, 1 Joh. 1. 5. & Epheſ. 5. 13. Then this *Light* which T. H. calls *Common*, and which we from Scripture ſay, *enlightens all Men*, is God, as Joh. 1. 4. *In him was Life, and that Life was the Light of Men.* And here is thy main Point concluded againſt thee. I ſhall add, *Reader*, to this, another Inſtance of his evaſive Carriage, which

which, I entreat thee to take particular notice of, that thou mayeſt ſee at what rate he ſhuffles with us.

In his firſt Dialogue, pag. 7. he quotes *Stephen Criſpinus*, *If the Light be obeyed, then it muſt be ſufficient*; and anſwers, *I grant it ought to be obeyed, ſo ought the lawful Commands of Maſters, &c. Yet who will thence infer, that they are a ſufficient Rule to Salvation?*

To this I replyed, as he quotes me, *Dial.* 3. *p.* 8. By the ſame Reaſon, that ſuch as obey the lawful Commands of Maſters, are reputed good Servants, *thoſe who obey the Light, are good Servants to God*: And if thoſe who ſo keep the Commandments of Maſters, obtain their Favour and Recompence; then thoſe who obey the Light, by *T. H.*'s Alluſion, *obtain God's Favour and Reward of Righteouſneſs*; unto which he makes this Return:

C. *This concludes not the* Queſtion *in Controverſie, therefore it can be no Prejudice to me.*

Q. No, *T. Hicks*? Is it nothing to the Purpoſe, that thoſe who obey the Light, *are ſaved from the Wrath, and receive the Favour and Reward of God*; as Servants which obey their Maſters Commands, are ſaved from the Wrath, and receive the Favour and Recompence of their Maſters? Let the Reader judge how much this concerns the Queſtion.

C. *I confeſs, the Light within ought to be obey'd, and ſo ought the lawful Commands of Maſters, from whence thou boldly, like thy ſelf, concludes* to the Sufficiency of the meer Light within: *Such Extravagancies as theſe, do ordinarily attend thy peculiar* Genius, Dial. 3. p. 9.

Q. Soft a little! If the Light ought to be obeyed, it is a ſufficient Rule for that Obedience: To keep to thy

own

own Parrallel of a *Maſter* and a *Servant*: How can a Servant be condemned of his Maſter for not anſwering his Command, whilſt the Maſter's Command is not a ſufficient Rule for the Servant's Obedience. *The Command implies a ſufficient Rule to the Performance of the thing commanded.*

C. *'Tis true, that God approves of Servants that do ſincerely obey the Commands of their Superiors; will it therefore follow, that their Commands are ſufficient to guide us to Salvation,* p. 9.

Q. What a wretched Shuffle is this? Was it ever the Queſtion, *Whether the Commands of Maſters were ſufficient to guide us to Salvation*? Or are the Commands of the Light about the Things of God, no more ſufficient to Salvation, then the Commands of Maſters (be they about what they will) are ſufficient to Salvation? Is not this a taking away the Compariſon, by putting the Subject of it in the Room of that for which it was brought? making Salvation to be as natural a Conſequence of following the Commands of Maſters, as of following the Requirings of the Light. But we are not ſo to be ſhifted off; for by the ſame Reaſon, that the civil Commands of a Maſter, obeyed, are ſufficient to the obtaining of a civil Salvation from Man's Wrath; *The ſpiritual Commands of the Light obeyed, are ſufficient to the obtaining of a ſpiritual Salvation*, that is, a being ſav'd from the Wrath to come, which is and ſhall be further revealed againſt all the Workers of Iniquity. Let me uſe thy own words, *T. H.* falſly reflected upon me in this very matter; *Where Proof is defective, thou begg'ſt the Queſtion* (nay, I may ſay, changeſt it) *and triumpheſt in thy own Confidence, which a modeſt Man would not do*: A-

way

way with these poor Shuffles for shame! Is this to evince the Matters objected to be real Truths?

But what sayest thou to my Argument p. 15. grounded on *Jo.* 1. 4? 'If God be Divine and sufficient to 'Salvation, and the Word be God, and the Life of the 'Word, one with the Word, and that *Life* the *Light* of 'men; then the Light of men is Divine and Sufficient 'to Salvation.

C. *Oh, what profound Divinity and exquisite Logick is this! I perceive thy Mind abounds with Ignorance, from the Arguments that spring thence. Thou hudlest the Principal Agent and Ordinary Means together,* p. 18.

Q. A rare Excuse for *thine*—— or something worse. Ought they not to be together in an Argument design'd to prove them one? *Ordinary Means* are thy own words, and not mine. A meer Shift for an Answer. But to go on.

C. *How can God himself be called a Means?* p. 18.

Q. After the same manner that his *Power* saveth us, and his Spirit sanctifieth us, and that *he becomes the Teacher of his People*; such a Means, if thou wilt call it so, my Argument was offered to prove the Light to be. Is this to act either the *Divine* or *Logician* after all thy conceited high Rants, thus pittifully to beg the Question? But what follows?

C. *Thy Argument is fallacious, because that which is spoken in the first should exactly be the Subject of the second Proposition,* p. 18.

Q. And so it is. See *Reas. against Rail.* p. 14.

C. *If the Proposition were right, yet thy Conclusion doth not reach the plain Terms of the Question, viz.* Therefore the common Light in every man is God, and sufficient to Salvation.

Q.

Q. Though I told thee before, that the word *common* is none of ours, yet I am not offended with it: For the Love of God is never the worse for being common, whatever thy *Reprobation-Faith* thinks of it. But art thou willing in earneſt this ſhould be the Queſtion between us? For I perceive, when thou art put to a Pinch, it is frequent with thee to turn me off with ſuch Expreſſions as theſe, *Prove this to be the Common Light within*; *What is this to the Common Light within men*? Meer Evaſions; and moſt times attended with hard words to cover them, as in pag. 9, 14, 15, 17, 39, 42, 43, 52, 53, &c.

C. This is the Controverſie between us, whether the Common Light in every man be God, Chriſt, and ſufficient to lead to Salvation, p. 8. *If thou couldſt demonſtrate this, it would put an Iſſue to a great part of the Controverſie between us*, Ibid. p. 17.

Q. Very well; Thou haſt granted, *that in the Word was Life, and that Life the Light of men*, as Joh. 1.4. on which I grounded my Argument; and that the *Life* and *Light* there mentioned, are one with the *Word* (or of its own Being) conſequently *God*, and *ſufficient to Salvation*. But that ſuch a Concluſion reacheth not the Terms of the Queſtion, to wit, the *Common Light in Men*; which thou denyeſt to be one with the *Life* of the *Word*, and therefore Inſufficient to Salvation. Upon this I thus argue, for the bringing of the Controverſie to an Iſſue.

If the Light of men, *John* 1.4. be the Light of *All* men, then is it a Light *common* to all men. Thou muſt deny one of theſe two, either that Light of Men is the Light of all Men; or, that the Light of *All* men is *common* to all men; The latter I ſhould think in

Point

Point of Reputation thou wilt not be ſo unreaſonable as to deny: The former then I muſt ſuppoſe thee to reject, viz. *That the Light of men, is the Light of all men.* This I ſhall maintain by the general Phraſe of Scripture, *Eccleſ.* 1. 13.—*This ſore Travail hath God given to the Sons OF MEN*, chap. 2. 3, 8. the ſame chap. 3. 10. *I have ſeen the Travail God hath given to the Sons OF MEN*, verſ. 18, 19. *That which befalleth the Sons OF MEN befalleth Beaſts; as the one dyeth ſo dyeth the other*, Jer. 32. 19. *Thine Eyes are upon all the Wayes of the Sons OF MEN, to give every one according to his Wayes.* Which prove, that OF MEN is meant OF ALL MEN. I will add two Places more out of *Prov.* 8. 4. *Unto you, O Men! I* (Wiſdom) *call, and my Voyce is to the Sons* OF MEN. And *ver.* 31. *My Delight is with the Sons* OF MEN. This proves Matter and Phraſe: For both *Of Men*, ſignifieth of *all Men*; and this Voice cometh from him, in whom are hid all the Treaſures of Wiſdom and Knowledge, even the *Eternal Word, in whom is Life, and that Life the Light of Men.* From all which I conclude, that the Light of men, is the Light of all Men, yea, *Every Man* that cometh into the World, *Joh.* 1. 9. And that the Light of all men, is a Light *Common* to all men; and that the Light that is common to all men, is *a Common* Light. Now *T. H.* thou hadſt done ſomething, if thou hadſt given us as plain Reaſon and Scripture for thy *Two Lights within*, Common and Special; and made good that *Diſtinction* between Light and Light, in *Job* 24. 13. *John* 1. 4, 9. chap. 3. 20, 21. *Epheſ.* 5. 13. 1 *John* 1. 5, 7. chap. 2. 8, 9, 10. and have told us, if thou couldſt, *Where the common Light endeth, and the ſpecial Light begins:* And if the *Special* reprove for Evil as well as the *Common* (which thou ſayeſt, reveals much,

much, and ought to be attended to) thou ſhouldſt have let us know how the Diſcoveries, Motions, Reproofs & Commands of the one might be diſcern'd and diſtinguiſhed from the other: For we own but *one real Spiritual Light* to the Sons of men, though divers Manifeſtations and Operations of that one Light, ſuited to the Capacities of all Perſons and Ages; and not to ſhuffle me off with asking me, *How canſt thou infer with ſuch preſumtuous Confidence, wilt thou dare ſtand by this Conſequence?* after thou *T. H.* haſt made it as Ugly as thy Malice and Diſhoneſty could well contrive. Mean Artifices to bear thy weak Reader in hand; thou haſt hit the Mark, when thou haſt all along ſhot quite beſide it; Practices, unworthy of any fair Diſputant, much more a Man of thy Pretences to *Religion.* Hadſt thou truly regarded that Light of which thou haſt writ ſo many ſlight things, we ſhould not have ſeen that *Envy, Paſſion, baſe Shuffling, Inſolence,* &c. that thy Writings now abound withall. Therefore under all thy higher Conceits thou ſtandeſt condemn'd of the Light: Be exhorted firſt to obey it, before thou undertakeſt to write of things thou vainly thinkſt beyond it.

Teſtimonies concerning the Light *Within.*

Munſterius, Caſtalio, Vatablus, Druſius, Clarius, Cocceius, upon *Job* 24. 13. & chap. 25. 3. *They are of thoſe who Rebel againſt the Light. Upon whom doth not his Light ariſe?* ſay, that this *Light* is of the *Divine Wiſdom and Fountain of Light,* alluding to the *Pſalmiſt,* Τὸ φῶς τῶ Ἰσραὴλ; and *Mat.* 4. 19. *The People that ſate in Darkneſs ſaw great Light.* Alſo ſee theſe Men, *Eraſmus* and *Camero* upon *John* 1. 4, 9.

I ſhall for a further Defence of the Light, produce

ſome Teſtimonies from ſeveral *Gentiles* ſome Hundreds of Years before Chriſt.

Orpheus, His Hand reaches to the End of the Sea, his Right Hand is every where (then within) of him alone are all things, *Clem. Alex. Strom. lib.* 5.

Thales thus, There is but one God; he is Glorious forever; he knows Hearts and tells Thoughts. He makes the Teller of his Thoughts God, as in *Amos* 4.13.

Pythagoras thus, *God reſembleth* LIGHT *and* TRUTH; *he is one; he is not* OUT *of the World; he is the* SALT *of all Ages*, ONE HEAVENLY LIGHT, *and Father of all things, only Wiſe, Inviſible, yet Intelligible.* The very Language of the Apoſtle, *Jambl. Juſt. Mart.*

Heraclitus thus, *God is not made with Hands.*

Pythagoras, *What things are agreeable to God cannot be known, unleſs a man* HEAR *God himſelf.*

Again, *Having overcome thy Rebellious Appetite, thou ſhalt know the* COHABITATION *of the Immortal God and Mortal Men; whoſe Work is Immortality, Eternal Life*, Tim. de Anim. Mund.

Sophocles, ſpeaking of the Precepts written in man's Heart, ſaith, *God is their Father, not Mortal Nature. Neither ſhall they ever be abrogated; for there is in them a great God that never waxeth old.* Again, ſaith he, This is with reſpect to man's Conſcience, *a Divine, a Sacred Good, God the Overſeer. Oedip. Tyr. Cl. Alex.* Str. l. 5.

Socrates had the *Guide of his Life within him*, and preach'd as he was moved by it, even in the Streets; And dyed for Reproving the Corruptions of the *Athenians* in Manners and Religion.

Plato taught, *That man had a Divine Principle in him, which maketh a True and Good Man.*

Hieron

Hieron called it, *A Domeſtick God.*

They held Victory over their Sins by the Power of it; witneſs *Chilon*, *Socrates*, *Plato*, *Zeno*, *Antipater* and others; which Doctrine of Perfection, thou *T. H.* with all thy pretended *ſuperadded* Light, can't tell how to ſwallow. As they preſt Perfect Living, ſo they clearly laid down Eternal Rewards, *the Pure to God, the Impure to Chains*, ſaid *Pythagoras*, as if he had read that Scripture writ Six Hundred Years after him, *The Pure in Heart ſhall ſee God.*

The Good, ſaid Socrates, *ſhall be united to God in an inacceſſible Place; the Wicked in convenient Places ſuffer due Puniſhment.*

And though they might not have the *Jewiſh* Hiſtory and Chronicle, yet they had a ſufficient Law and Light within to Salvation; and ſuch as truſted in it, came to Salvation by it: and ſo much the Apoſtle ſayes, *Rom.* 2.

And for the *Fathers*, that they confirm the *Teſtimonies* of the *Gentiles*, and ſpeak not of another *Eternal Law and Light*; briefly thus.

Juſtin Martyr in his *Apology* ſaith, *God has built to himſelf a natural Temple in the Conſciences of men*, as the place wherein he would be worſhipped, and there men ought to look for his Appearance.

Clem. Alex. Admon. ad Gent. *It is the Voice of Truth that Light will ſhine out of Darkneſs. Therefore does it ſhine in the hidden part of Mankind.*

Strom. l. 5. *Man cannot be void of Divine Knowledge, who naturally, or* as he comes into the World, *partakes of Divine Inſpiration.*

Lactant. de Cult. ver. *The Law of God is made known unto us*, whoſe Light clearly diſcovers the Path

of Wisdom. *That Law is pure and unspotted Reason, diffused through all the World.*

Athanas. contr. Gent. *The Way to attain to the Knowledge of God,* is Within us; *which is proved from* Moses, *who saith,* The Word of God is within thy Heart; *and from this saying of Christ,* The Faith and Kingdom of God is within you.

§. II. *Concerning the* Soul *of* Man.

Counterfeit. I *affirm that* G. Fox *sayes, the Soul of Man* is Part of God's being without Beginning, and infinite, *which is to say, The Soul is God,* Dial. 3. *pag.* 19.

Quaker. I have two things to say: *First,* That in case *G. F.* so holds, thou hast done unworthily to conclude generally against the *Quakers*: In thy former *Dialogues* thou chargedst it upon the *Quakers*; and now thou layest it directly upon *G. F.* Are such Shiftings & Runnings from *Generals* to Particulars allowable in Disputation? Is this equal Dealing? But *2dly,* I deny that *G. F.* so holds; what sayest thou to that?

C. G. Fox *in his* Great Mystery, p. 90. *in Answer to one that said, There is a kind of Infiniteness in the Soul; yet it cannot be Infiniteness in it self, speaks thus*: Is not the Soul without Beginning, coming from God, returning into God again? Hath this Beginning or Ending? and is not this Infinite in it self? *Can any thing be clearer then that* G. F. *makes the Soul the Subject, and not the Divine Life?* Ibid. pag. 20, 21.

Q. Yes, that there may: For it is clear enough that

G. F.

G. F. intends by the Soul and Breath coming out from God, *the Divine Breath, or Soul of the Soul*, as *Auguſtine* calls it; and as *Mach, Neſhemah, Pneuma, Anemos* and *Spiritus* ſignifie. 'Twas this made *Adam* a living Soul to God [Thou dealeſt unfairly with *G. F.* and us in making his Queſtions about this, both his and our Affirmation, *That the Soul* (or Spirit) *of Man is God*. A manifeſt Falſehood and Abuſe.] And was not the *Death* threathned *Adam* upon Diſobedience, the Loſs of this? They that read *G. F*'s Books with a more impartial mind then thou doeſt, may ſee that ſometimes he ſpeaketh of the Soul, as of the Man, *pag.* 91. where he ſayes, *That ſuch as receive the Light, receive Redemption, whor by their Spirits, Bodies & Souls are ſanctified*; and ſometimes he ſpeaks of the Soul, as reſpecting that *Breath of Life*, by which it became a living Soul to God, which is Man in the Heavenly Image. He that reads *page* 90, 91, 100. may diſcern the Truth of this But why art thou not angry with the PRIEST, for talking of a kind of *Infiniteneſs* in the Soul? 'Tis at the *Quaker* and not the *Principle*, thy Gall is ſtirr'd: For a kind of *Infiniteneſs* muſt be an *Infiniteneſs*, and not a *Finiteneſs*. Did *G. F*'s words at moſt riſe higher? What further doeſt thou object?

C. *But* G. F. *ſaith* pag. 100. God breathed into man the Breath of Life, and he became a Living Soul; and is not this which cometh out from God, part of God? which Soul Chriſt is the Biſhop of. *Can* Fox *here intend, that Chriſt is the Biſhop of the Divine Life, &c? Yet is he as abſurd in calling Chriſt the Biſhop of the Soul: For if the Soul be part of God's Being, and Chriſt be God, then one part of God muſt be Biſhop over another*, Ibid. p. 21, 22.

R. Suppoſe this Cavil had any thing in it, and that

thou hadſt herein faithfully repreſented our Belief, might not I retort upon thy own Creed, that *God is the Father of God*: And when Chriſt prayed, *God prayed to God*; ſince the One Nature could not pray without the other, and the Spirit makes Interceſſion, that is, *God intercedes with God*: What thinkſt thou of this *T. Hicks*? Beſides I told thee then, that God inſpired man with ſomething of his own Subſtance in the Name of *R. Nahmanni*, *Hiskuni*, and *P. Fagius*, That God contributed ſomething to him, and beſtowed ſomething of his own Divinity upon him, and that thou didſt manifeſt thy ſelf an ungodly Perſon, for inferring that what is vulgarly call'd the *Soul of Man*, to wit, the meer Creature, is part of God's own Subſtance, becauſe we aſſerted, that the *Life*, *Breath* or *Soul*, as it may very well be term'd, which God breathed into man, was of his own Being and Subſtance: what ſayeſt thou to this?

C. *If G.F. be underſtood to ſpeak with Reverence to the Soul, then my Inference is natural & proper*, viz. *That the Soul is of God's Subſtance, and part of God's Being*, p. 22.

Q. Are all thy Brags come to this? Take *Soul* as before expreſſed, and it is granted without any Dammage to our Doctrine: For the Scriptures that teſtifie, God communicated of his own Breath or Life unto Man, whereby he became a living Soul, do not confound man and that Divine Life; no more doth G.F. he never affirmed Man to be God, his own words diſtinguiſh them, viz. *God breathed into man*, &c. and conſequently, that Man is not that Breath of God which he inſpired Man with. Again, G. F. in many of his Writings, ſpeaks of the *Fallen and Degenerated State of Men, the great Pollution and Wickedneſs they lie and live in; and that heavy Wrath and Vengeance which will follow*: all which con-

cerns *Man*, and not that *Divine Life God hath breathed into Man*; It was not *That*, but *Adam* which was beguiled: Had *Adam* liv'd in *That Life*, he had been preſerved. But ſuppoſe what I ſaid granted the Queſtion, as it did not, Many Great and Learned Men have run in the ſame Line, and they eſcaped the Cryes of *Blaſphemy*, *Abſurdity*, and the reſt of thy Exclamatory Termes from Millions: What makeſt thou keep ſuch a Barking at us? Is it that thou haſt more *Authority*, or leſs Candor?

Before I conclude this Section, I would put thee in mind of a double Injuſtice thou haſt committed: The one was in making this falſe & Prophane Conſequence, *That God ſets up a Light in himſelf, which he himſelf is to obey, and in ſo doing God ſhall be ſaved*, to follow from *G. F's* words forecited. The ſecond is in thy giving this ſharp Rebuke for this Paſſage, as an *Anſwer* in thy *Dialogue*, *without ſo much as inſerting one word of it*, that thou mightſt cover thy own Unrighteouſneſs, and render me ſevere. Theſe Tricks, *T. H.* will never compaſs thy End, but greatly contribute to fruſtrate it.

§. III. *Concerning the* Redemption *of the* Seed.

Counterfeit, FOr *aſmuch as Chriſt came to ſeek and to ſave that which was loſt, I did query, who or what was that which was loſt?* Ibid. p. 34.

Quaker, I know thou didſt; and that thou madeſt *G. Keith* anſwer, *That which is loſt is ſtill in man, that Chriſt came to ſeek and ſave, and all his Miniſters preached People to this, A loſt God, a loſt Chriſt, &c.*

Upon which thou madeſt this Exclamation, *Bluſh Oh Heavens, and be Aſtoniſhed O Earth, &c! Did Jeſus Chriſt come to ſeek and ſave a loſt God, a loſt Chriſts was ever God and Chriſt in a* LOST CONDITION? I told thee then, and do ſtill, that the *Heavens* and the *Earth* might bluſh at thy baſe Dealings with *G. K.* I alſo told thee, as thou haſt cited me, that he intended no other then that Chriſt came to ſeek and to ſave, *by turning* People *to enquire after a loſt God and a loſt Chriſt.*

What ſayſt thou to this?

C. *If by* Loſt *we muſt not underſtand man's loſt Condition; what leſs can be underſtood, but that Jeſus came to ſeek and to ſave a loſt God. 'Tis true,* G. K, *ſpeaks of People's* FINDING *a loſt God, whom they had loſt,* Ibid. p. 35.

Q. If this be true, that *G. K.* ſo ſpeaks, to wit, that by loſt God, he underſtood People's looſing of God, what's become of thy *Bluſh O Heavens,* &c. *Is God and Chriſt in a loſt Condition?* It is well thou art drawn to confeſs this againſt thy ſelf.

C. *But ſtill, if Loſt be meant only of God and Chriſt, how can Chriſt be ſaid to ſeek and ſave a loſt God?* Ibid.

Q. No ſuch words ever fell from *G.K.* to any ſuch Queſtion, as thou makeſt them an Anſwer to. Thou haſt unworthily perverted both his Words and Senſe. Though *loſt* be ſaid of God, yet the Loſs is Man's; For every man who hath loſt God is truly in a *loſt Condition*: But to apply that *loſt Condition* to God, and not man, becau'e man hath loſt God, and is admoniſhed to ſeek after a loſt God, is to commit great Injury againſt us, as thou haſt attempted with thy ſilly Inſinuation, viz. *If Loſt be meant* ONLY *of God and Chriſt*,

Christ, &c. What poor begging Shifts art thou put to?

C. *But to put the Reader out of Doubt, that what I infer is indeed your very Opinion,* G. F. *and* J. N. *tell us, that the Seed wants Redemption, and the Seed is Christ, either then there must be more Christs then one, or Christ came to redeem himself,* Ibid.

Q. Is it to put us out of Doubt, to leave it in Doubt whether *G. F.* and *J. N.* ever said any such thing, or these words, as laid down together? for thou referrest to no Book.

But suppose it be true; will it bear thy Inference; *therefore God and Christ are in a lost Condition?* Is it all one to say, that Christ is bruised and oppressed, and crucified afresh by wicked Men, and put to open Shame; and to say, *That Christ is in a lost Condition?* If it be not, as every ordinary Capacity may easily see; how needless, as well as how false is this Rant of thine? p. 36. viz. *Wilt thou assert the very thing which I infer from your Words, and yet say, I pervert them; May we not justly esteem of thee, as a heady, rash and inconsiderate young Man, &c.* Thus *T. H* where it is impossible for thee to make good thy Conclusions, thou tellest me of granting the Charge, and then fallest into thy usual Insults, the better to insinuate a Credence of thy Ability and Honesty with thy *Reader.*

C. *But is it not absurd, yea, blasphemous, to talk of God's redeeming the Seed?* Ibid.

Q. No more Blasphemy then is in the Scripture, which sayes, *Out of* Egypt *have I called my Son, a Place of Burdens.* But I the less wonder at thy Ignorance in these Heavenly Things, who never yet drunk of his Cup, nor was baptized with his Baptism, nor knew the true

Fel-

Fellowship of his Death and Sufferings; but art now adding to them by as provoaking Impieties, as any man of this Age hath committed against him.

Give me thy Judgment of these Scriptures, and my Consequence from them. *And God saw that there was no man, and wondred that there was no Intercessor; therefore his Arm brought Salvation to him, and Righteousness it sustained him*, Isaiah 59. 16. Again, *The Year of my Redeemed is come, and I looked, and there was none to help, and I wondred that there was none to uphold; therefore mine own Arm brought Salvation unto me, and my Fury it upheld me*, Chap. 53. 4, 5. Whence it is no Contradiction to say, *That God did rid himself of the Enemies of his own precious Life, or that he brought Salvation to himself.*

C. *I infer from your Words this horrid Absurdity*, that God redeems himself, p. 37. *This is thy Truth against Fiction.*

Q. It is not from our Words, but the Words of Scripture; and but that thou art become shameless, I should wonder that any Man pretending the Scriptures to be his Rule, should charge plain Scripture with *Absurdity* and *Blasphemy.*

C. *Thus Christ is at one and the same time at Liberty and in Bondage, redeeming and redeemed, conquering and yet pressed down: And though this kind of Language be Folly and Madness, yet thou tellest us, thou art content to use it*, p. 38.

Q. And it were well if thou wouldst be contented, not to abuse it: Is this thy Religion, to vilifie the Language of other Peoples Religion; nay, of holy Scripture it self?

But how dark art thou *T. Hicks*, to make both a Won-

Wonder and a Scoff at Chriſt's *conquering* and yet being *preſſed* down at the ſame Time; when the Scripture ſo plainly holds forth, that he is *crucified* by ſuch counterfeit *Chriſtians* as thou art, at what Time he *reigns* in the Hearts of his Children? And is not the Spirit ſaid to be *quenched* by ſome, at what Time it *lives* in others? And is he not grieved by the Rebellions of ſome, whilſt he is delighted in others? Was not God *at Liberty* at what Time he ſaid, They made him *ſerve* with their Sins? And was he not *whole*, at what Time he ſaid, He was *broken*, *Ezek.* 6. 9. Canſt thou reaſonably infer, becauſe of theſe Expreſſions, us'd after the manner of men, that it is Abſurdity and Blaſphemy, that God *heals* himſelf, *delivers* himſelf, and *eaſes* himſelf of his Enemies; Words of equal Import? Methinks thy unſavory Carriage ſhould reflect Shame upon *W. Kiffin*, with his Elders, &c. to ſuffer ſuch irreverent Traſh to come out of their Congregation; if they value their Credit, they will not ſuffer thee any longer thus upon the Ramble. But before I leave thee in this Section, I have one thing more to charge thee with, and that is, not only the Abuſe of our words, by concluding from Man's being turned to ſeek after a loſt God and Chriſt, that God and Chriſt are in a *loſt Condition*, but that they only want Redemption, and that *Men and Women are not the Objects of Redemption*, as in 3 *Dial.* p. 37. Then which nothing can be more falſe, and conſequently, injurious to a People. But I have left wondering, that thou ſhouldſt be baſe.

* T.H. takes that literally, which is metaphorically ſpoken, both in Scripture and our Books, and makes literal Conſequences upon metaphorical Premiſes, as if God had Hands, Eyes, Head, Arms, could be imbondaged, broken, &c. after a Worldly Manner, or in a ſtrict and proper Senſe, and not rather in a more hidden Metaphorical Signification; He is herein either very blind or very malitious.

§. IV.

§. IV. *Concerning our Belief in* Christ.

Quaker. ANother Inſtance by which thou undertakeſt to prove the *Quaker* no *Chriſtian*, is, *his Denyal of Jeſus Chriſt to be a diſtinct Perſon without him*: Is this true, or no?

Counterfeit. *I accuſe you for denying Jeſus Chriſt to be a diſtinct Perſon without you*, p. 25.

Q. I ſay that thou haſt varied thy Charge, and given thy ſelf an Anſwer to it out of my Book, which was never an Anſwer to any ſuch Matter, viz. *Herein thou haſt ſhewn thy Ignorance and Malice*; nor is it ſo in my Book, but Ignorance or Malice: Thou alſo omitteth the Ground of my ſo ſpeaking, which is not fair, viz, *The* Quakers *ſay, that Chriſt is in them, Chriſt is God-man; is God-man in them?* Again, *there is but one Chriſt, born of a Virgin, that ſuffered at* Jeruſalem: *Can that Chriſt be in Man?* In Defence of which ſtrange Conſtruction of our Belief, thou haſt offered nothing to what I oppoſed. Howbeit, I deſire my *Reader* to take notice, that ſince thou pretendeſt to own but one Chriſt, and ſayſt, that it is impoſſible that Chriſt ſhould be in Man, that thou both denyeſt the Scripture, and contradicteſt thy ſelf; there is not any Doctrine clearer in holy Record, then that of Chriſt's indwelling with his Saints, *Joh.* 14. 20, 23. *Chap.* 15. 4, 5. *Chap.* 17. 23. *Rom.* 8. 10. 2 *Cor.* 13. 5. *Gal.* 1. 16. *Col.* 1. 27. *Revel.* 3. 20.

The ſame Objection thou makeſt againſt us, holds good againſt them, as thus, Chriſt is *God-man*; can *God-man* be in the *Corinthians*? What might not a *T. Hicks* have cavilled againſt Chriſt and his Diſciples,

as

as well as againſt us? Is this the Way to prove the *Quaker* no *Chriſtian*, that makes that Thing Error, which can only conſtitute Men right *Chriſtians*: For if Chriſt be not there, no *Anointing* can be there, which *John* ſayes, leads into all Truth: Beſides, thou contradicteſt thy ſelf, as thou mayeſt ſee, *Dial.* p. 22, 23. But to thy preſent Charge.

C. *This I object againſt you, your denying Chriſt to be a diſtinct Perſon without you; to which thou ſpeakeſt nothing, ſignifying thereby, that you are pinched,* Ibid. p. 26.

Q. I told thee under the Head of *Perverſions*, that this was not all thou madeſt us to deny; for thou didſt untruly infer *Our Denyal of Chriſt's Bodily Appearance*, concerning which thou ſpeakeſt nothing, *ſignifying thereby, that thou art pinched*, unleſs it be to deny thou ever ſaidſt ſo, as p. 26, 31. thereby adding a Lye to the Shuffle. But why are we pinched, becauſe we ſay nothing to a Doctrine the Scripture ſayes nothing of: Give me one Place that mentions Chriſt *to be a diſtinct Perſon without us*; art thou ſo deſtitute of common Senſe, as to think of proving the *Quaker* no *Chriſtian*, becauſe he denies a Doctrine, not expreſſed in Scripture; and yet at that Inſtance to magnifie the Scripture, as thy ſole Rule: Verely, thou makeſt thy ſelf a Deriſion to all wiſe Men. But go on, make the beſt of thy Charge.

C. G. F. *in his Great Myſtery*, p. 16. *writes thus*, Thou art deceived, who ſayeſt Chriſt is diſtinct from the Saints: Can any Man eat the Fleſh of Chriſt, if his Fleſh be not in them?

Q. This propably thou mayſt have found in thy Brother Faldo's *Book, and thou might'ſt have found it defended in mine.* Where is *Diſtinct* among *G. F.*'s Words, which

are

are these, 'But God and Christ is in his Saints, and dwell in them, and walk in them; and he, the Priest, is 'Reprobate, and out of the Apostles Doctrine: which plainly shews that *G. F.* only opposeth Christ's being *at a Distance*, as divided from the Saints, because they who know not Christ to be in them the Apostle terms *Reprobates*; and not that Christ and his Saints are in distinct Beings. That Christ's Flesh must be in People if they eat it, is so far from being either Matter of Error, or any Proof for thee, that, till thou canst prove, how a Man may eat his Victuals without him, thou wilt but render thy self ridiculous in talking at such an idle rate. What else hast thou to offer?

C. G. Whitehead *saith*, Jesus Christ a Person without us, is not Scripture-Language, *Dip. pl.* p. 13.—— We cannot own your Limitations and unscriptural Notions concerning Christ's Being, *R. against R.* 1. p. 22.

Q. But (why dost thou leave out the Word *God-man*, which thou usedst at *first*, and was repeated by *G. W.*) what of all this *T. H*?

C. If these be your Words, wherein is my Ignorance or Malice manifest, in giving the World an Account of your Belief? Ibid. p. 26.

Q. Thou mightst as well have said of our Dis-Belief of thy unscriptural Belief: Canst thou upon second Thoughts perswade thy self, that this is the way to prove the Quaker *no* Christian, *condemn him out of his own Mouth and evince his Errors to the World*, that wanderest from sound Doctrine and wholsom Words, to effect it. Howbeit, not so much for thy sake, who makest it thy Business to render us a Scorn and Reproach among Men, by the most injurious Practices upon our Persons and Principles; as for theirs in whom there is some

Ten-

Tenderneſs and ſober Enquiry, I ſhall endeavour to take away all Occaſion of Stumbling, by this ſhort and ſerious Account of our Belief.

'Tis granted, that Chriſt, who is God over all, bleſſed for ever, is a *diſtinct* Being (though not *at a Diſtance*) from the Saints; Otherwiſe, it would be all one indeed to ay, as thou, *T. H.* wickedly concludeſt, p. 30. from thy own Invention of Man's being the Seed, which is God, that it is all one, whether we call *God* by the Name of *W. Penn* or call *W. Penn God* and *Chriſt*; a Blaſphemous Abſurdity indeed, as thou ſayeſt! But then, what art thou that madeſt it? Next, we never ſaid, that Chriſt was not as well *without* us, as *within* us; for we cannot comprehend him, but are comprehended of him: We never ſet any Limitations to Chriſt's Preſence; they are the falſe and hateful Inferences of our Enemies; And let the Reader beware, that he be not abuſed by them. For the Word *Perſon* (as thou uſeſt it, in telling us of *Chriſt, God-man*, a diſtinct Perſon without thee) it is no Scripture-Phraſe; for in *Heb.* 1. 3. Ὑποστάσις, *Hypoſtaſis* ſignifies *Subſtance*; and in 2 *Cor.* 2. 10. ἐν τῷ προσώπῳ χριστοῦ, ſignifies *in Chriſt's Stead, Name, Sight or Authority, or for his ſake*, as *Grotius, Eraſmus* and the Ancient Fathers have it. However, I hope for our Tenderneſs in this particular, conſidering that *T. H*'s Charge is no Scripture-Phraſe, and that ſuch like Expreſſions occaſion People to retain mean and dark Apprehenſions of God, and Chriſt, and his Place of Reſidence; we ſhall not ſuffer in the Mind of our ſober *Reader*, as Men undeſerving the Name of *Chriſtians*. Haſt thou *T. H.* any more to offer upon this Head?

C. *If the Light be Jeſus Chriſt, and a Meaſure of it in all Men, but more eminently in your ſelves; whether*

W. P. *and* G. W. *may not as properly be called Jesus Christ, as well as that Bodily Appearance or Outward Person? And why may not divine Worship be given as well to you as to him?*

Q. That Jesus Christ is the *Light of Men*, the Scripture holds forth; but that *W. P.* or *G. W.* should be the *Proper Body* prepared of God, for himself to be manifested in (as was that in which God was manifested in the Flesh: in whom dwelt the Fulness of the God-head) is not scriptural, nor a Consequence from our Opinion; but a blasphemous Inference of thy making, to be abhorred of just Men. Are we Christ's Body, *as that was*? Did we ever say, that the Fulness of the God-head dwelt bodily in us? He is manifested in us measurably, to save us: But was he so manifested in that Manhood to save it? Or is either *G. W.* or *W. P.* as properly and peculiarly the Man-hood of the Saviour, as that he took to manifest himself Saviour in? Thou shalt see whither thy *Sophistry* will lead thee: *The Son of God* appeared bodily and visibly at *Jerusalem*: The Son of God was revealed in *Paul*; therefore *Paul* might as well be called *Jesus Christ* as he, in that Appearance. Again, Divine Worship is to be given to Christ: but Christ was in *Paul*; *therefore divine Worship was to be given to* Paul. Again, *T. H.* doubtless, at least many of the *Baptists*, believe they have the Spirit of God, and that the Spirit of God is God, and therefore to be worshipped; will it be a good Consequence, *That* T. H. *or those* Baptists *are to be worshipped*? These vain *Cavils* and *Sophisms* thou undertakest to entertain thy *Reader* with, and to abuse us by, are great Instances of a weak Cause and an evil Mind.

Q. Be not angry if again I ask thee, if Christ signifie Anointed,

Anointed, and God be Chriſt, as thou affirmeſt; whether God himſelf be Anointed, Ibid. p. 32.

Q. It ſeems then, *Sotinian*-like, thou doſt not affirm that God is Chriſt; and yet it is but two Pages before that thou ſayſt, *The God-head of the Son, and the Manhood conjunct is the Chriſt.* And *Dial. p.* 44, Thou calleſt *God manifeſt in the Fleſh, Chriſt.* Is not God then Chriſt by thy own words? But what Anſwer did I give thee to thy Queſtion about Anointing?

C. *Thou ſayeſt,* Chriſt was not anointed by Halfes but entirely; *herein thou contradicteſt thy ſelf, and overthroweſt thy own Diſtinction between Chriſt and the Body of Chriſt.*

Q. No ſuch matter; for the Diſtinction came from thy inſinuating, that the Man-hood of Chriſt was the the Chriſt, becauſe that only could be Anointed, upon which, knowing it was lately thy Opinion, that Chriſt was God as well as Man, I ſaid, that he could not be anointed by Halfes; *and therefore Chriſt was anointed as God as well as Man*: What ſayſt thou to this?

C. *The Difficulty ſtill remains: If God alone was that which was anointed, the Queſtion returns upon thee, whether God did anoint himſelf, and with what, and to what End?*

Q. Thou art miſtaken, and miſerably begſt the Queſtion, and ſendeſt it back again: For when thou (to prove the meer Manhood to be the Chriſt or Anointed) didſt inſinuate the Impoſſibility of Chriſt's being anointed as God: I did then, and now more largely return this to thee, ſince thou confeſſeſt Chriſt to be *God* as well as *Man*, and that *God manifeſt in the Fleſh*, makes the true Chriſt or Anointed, and that it is abſurd to think he ſhould be anointed by Halfs: Is not God or the di-

vine Nature alſo anointed? if ſo, T. H. *who is it that anointed the God-head, and with what, and to what End?* Theſe are thy own Words, and they belong to thy own Doctrine. Thou didſt object againſt our Principle, and hapned to contradict thy own Principle in it: I ſent thee the Objection home again, for thee to diſingage thy own Principle of it, *Firſt*, Thou groweſt angry, telleſt me of contradicting my ſelf, and returneſt me the Objection never conſidered; but back it muſt go; and when thou haſt found the way to clear thy own, that ſhall ſerve for thine and mine too. And thus I leave thee and thy Cavils in this Section.

---

§. V. *Concerning the* Goſpel-Rule.

LEt us hear what thou haſt to ſay to the Arguments I gave about the Rule.

C. *You deny the Scriptures to be the Rule of Faith and Practice unto* Chriſtians, p. 38.

R. Thou would'ſt here inſinuate, as if our Faith and Practice were not according to Scripture, becauſe we do not aſſert them, but the Spirit that gave them forth, to be the Rule, eſpecially, in new-Covenant Times: I grant the Scriptures are to be fulfilled, and that many Heavenly Exhortations, Reproofs & Inſtructions therein contained, are to be regarded by us; but that which is my Rule to direct my Underſtanding, what is fit for me to embrace, and what to reject, and how to underſtand that which is to be received, muſt be the Spirit of Truth, which alone gives true Diſcerning: Therefore let us hear what thou ſayeſt to my Argument, *Reaſ. againſt Rail.*

Rail. p. 25. as thou they ſelf has cited it, *Dial.* 3. p. 38. *viz.* 'That which is more *Ancient*, more *uni-* 'verſal, and more *able* to inform, rule and guide, 'that muſt more *eminently* be the Rule: But that hath 'been, and is, the *Light within*; therefore that hath 'been, and ought to be the Rule of Faith and Practice: What doſt thou offer to invalidate this Argument?

C. *Then herein I have not miſrepreſented your Belief*, p. 39.

Q. But is this the Way to confute our Belief? Or did we charge thee with miſrepreſenting it in this particular? Doſt thou think thus to evince the Truth of thy Objections, to grant us the Matter objected: It ſeems, we are to take this for thy Anſwer; and conſequently, that the *Light within is eminently the Rule*, for ought thou haſt ſaid againſt it. Proceed.

C. *But foraſmuch as you often ſay, you own the Scriptures, and the holy Rules therein contained: In what Senſe do you acknowledge them to be your Rule?*

Q. Thou makeſt me to anſwer this Queſtion thus, *The Scripture is the Rule of Hiſtorical Faith; the Spirit can only be the Rule of ſaving Faith*, Reaſ. ag. Rail. p. 40. But can any Man that hath the leaſt Draghm of Honeſty or Juſtice, think this the Way to confute me, to skip over near 15. Pages, containing ſeveral Arguments made to evidence and confirm the Truth of the firſt?

Had'ſt thou not a Conſcience that dares do and ſay any thing, thou could'ſt never have given me ſuch an unhandſom Slip. But let us hear what thou ſayſt to that which thou haſt cited.

C. *If the Light within be more able to inform, rule and guide, and therefore more eminently the Rule; what need is there of an hiſtorical Rule?* p. 39.

Q. Did ever any Man pretending to be in his Wits,

talk ſo idly? what is it but to ſay, *If the Spirit of God was alwayes more able then the Scripture; what need is there of having Scripture?* Is not this to infer from God's Condeſcenſion to Man's Imbecillity, that the Light and Spirit of God are Imbecil: Is not this to reprobate all external Means, and to conclude God, Chriſt, the Light and Spirit inſufficient, becauſe that any were ever uſed: Is it a good Argument, becauſe the Light does not reveal ſuch a thing, therefore the Light *cannot* reveal ſuch a thing, which is the utmoſt Strength of thy Oppoſition. I further told thee, that thoſe who gave forth the Scripture, came by the Enjoyment of thoſe Things through the Light and Spirit of God, or they could never have writ them; therefore the Light and Spirit, and not the Scriptures, were the Rule of their Faith. But of this and abundance more to the ſame Purpoſe, thou takeſt no notice: I further told thee, that the Prophets ſaw him with this Light, unleſs they ſaw him without Light, and that thoſe that believed him, when come, could not have received him, had they not beheld him with an inward Eye. Thus thou quoteſt me: What Reply makeſt thou to this?

C. *That the Prophets ſaw him by the Light of divine Revelation, I grant: And that none do believe in him, that do not know him is true; but that this* Light *or inward Eye is the* common Light *in every Man, that thou muſt prove*, p. 42.

Q. It was formerly, and is again proved to be the *ſame Light*, though not the ſame in Manifeſtations: Every one had the ſame Light, but not the *ſame Prophecies*, nor the ſame *Sights*: When thou haſt proved *two inward Lights*, it will be Time for thee to talk at this Rate: Nothing did then, nor can now, lead truly

to

to know and confeſs to the Word that took Fleſh, in which VVord was Life, and that Life the Light of Men; but ſuch Diſcoveries as proceed from a Meaſure of the ſame Light, as hath been already proved. And ſhould I admit of thy Conſtruction, that the Light by which ſuch as had a true Sight of Chriſt before, and at his Coming, was not the common Light, as thou calleſt it; but that which thou thy ſelf alloweſt to be divine; yet wilt thou give me Leave to infer in thy Name, that the divine Light was inſufficient, before ſuch time as it reveald thoſe Things to the Prophets, and gave thoſe that were alive at Chriſt's Spiritual Coming, a Knowledge and a Senſe of them, becauſe they did not know them before they knew them: For at this Rate thou treateſt us about the Light within; the Light within doth not do this, *therefore the Light within cannot do it*, preſumptuouſly concluding it inſufficient to diſcover thoſe things, that either do not need a Diſcovery, becauſe they are already known, or that it ſeemeth good to God in his VViſdom to conceal.

C. *If the Scriptures tell thee there was ſuch a Man as* Moſes, David *and* Matthew, &c. *without which thou couldſt not have known any ſuch thing; ſo the Scripture tells thee what they ſpake and wrot of; therefore the Scriptures muſt be the Rule of thy Belief, both concerning thoſe Men and their Sayings*, p. 45.

Q. I grant that the Scriptures tell me, there were ſuch Men, as *Moſes*, *David* and *Matthew*, and that they wrote: But what is it that gives me to believe the things they wrote to be true? The Rule of ſaving Faith is that we ſpeak of, and *not* that which is hiſtorical? It is impoſſible for me to underſtand the Truth of thoſe Things, till I come to that Spirit of Truth that gave them forth; for no Man can know the Things of God,

save the Spirit of God. The want of which hath been the Cause why so many have been bewildred about the things there declared: Spiritual and heavenly Things are not discernable by carnal Men, they are hid from their Eyes; & till the Light shine out of Darkness, to give them the Knowledge of the Scriptures; they are as a sealed Book, and they labour in a *Labyrinth* of Uncertainties. I do say again, The Light in all Ages hath made known *Doctrines*, fit to be obeyed, though not the *Histories* and *Narratives* of other Mens Actions; which is thy silly *Objection* against the Light's Sufficiency. But one thing I must not forget, on which thou didst not depend *a little*, as an Instance to prove thy Conceit, viz. *How could we have known, that Swearing in any Case were un-*

I would ask him how he knows the Scriptures extant are perfect, both as to Number, and Copy and Translations? Several Books are lost, that is certain; does the Scripture tell us what they contained? if not, the Rule is imperfect by T. H's Consequence. The *Copies* are above *Thirty in Number*, at least, in which there are *Thousands of different Readings; the Translators greatly differ*, and have *greatly corrupted*. Also T. H is to look to prove the present Collection Canonical. If he pleads the Testimony of God within, *his Cause is gone*; if Tradition, I ask how? Is he assured the first *Canon* was rightly made? The Council as either Fallible or Infallible; If the First, what Assurance has he? If the last, it grants Infallibility, since the Apostles 360. Years; but begets the Question, How does T. H. know they were in the right? And if in one Thing, why not in all? But those Councils contradicted; and none ever gave the Catalogue, as now it is; nor can T. H. give a Canon for it. And if he cannot assure us, that it is exact with the *Original*, free from *Variation*, *Corruption*, *Mistranslation*, &c. as it is not; he can never prove it *the Rule*, as he endeavours, in Opposition to the Spirit; for that is always plain and perfect. But more of this in the *Christian Quaker*; not to lessen Scripture, but to confound such Cavilers.

unlawful, if it had not been written in the 5th *of* Matthew *Swear not at all*, Dial. 1. p. 22. But this I proved to thee, to have been revealed above 400. Years before that was written; but what is the Reason thou overlookest that Answer? *Clinias* was taught by it rather to suffer a great Fine, then swear; the *Essæans* had rather dye then swear, which was long before Christ came in the Flesh: Was not the Light then a sufficient Rule for their practising of an Evangelical Doctrine by thy own Argument? But *T. H.* art thou not greatly ashamed, that because I supposed upon thy Principle, *the Light and Rule to be two*, Reas. against Rail. p. 39. That therefore I contradict my self, and overthrow mine own Opinion, saying, *If Light be given to understand the Rule, then it self is not the Rule, much less greater then the Rule*; and as if thou hadst come rightly by this Consequence, falling into thy customary Insults, telling me, *This is so far from being Truth against Fiction, that it discovers me to be a rash, heady, confident and ignorant Man, one that neither cares what he sayes or affirms.* Hadst thou any Regard to God, thy own Conscience, thy Neighbour, or thy own Reputation, thou wouldst never commit, much less continue to practise, these horrid Wrongs against me. However, as I said before, so again: I affirm, that supposing the Scriptures were the Rule, that which informs me of the Rule, and teaches me how to use it, *must be greater then the Rule*, in that it teaches me to know and do what the Rule cannot do of it self: I query then, if this Light be not the Rule, how and which way I come to understand and use the Scriptures? &c. therefore *eminently the Rule*, the Terms of my Argument; for the Question lay not upon particular Rules.

C.

C. *The Primitive* Christians *took not their Measures from the* Light within, *but from the Will of God revealed to them*, p. 46.

Q. This is Confusion it self: Are the Light within and the Will of God revealed inconsistent things? Who was it revealed to them (*Paul* turned from Darkness to (Light the Will of God, but the Light? And what was it taught them the Truth, when *John* said, *They had received an Anointing, which abode in them, and taught them all things*; unto which he directed, and with which he left them, *John* 1. 2, 27. And doth not the same Apostle tell us, If we walk in the Light, we have Fellowship one with another, &c? Was not the Light then the Rule of their Obedience, and the Way in which they were to walk? for the Accomplishment of that Prophetick Speech, Isa. 2. 5. *Oh ye House of* Jacob, *come ye, and let us walk in the Light of the Lord.*

And is there any thing plainer, then that the Apostle *Paul* describes the Children of God, to be such as are *led* by the Spirit of God, *Rom.* 8. 14. and that he exhorts the *Galatians* to *walk* in the Spirit, chap. 5. 16 and the *Ephesians* to *walk* circumspectly, which was according to the Manifestations of the Light, chap. 5. 14, 15, 16. Finally, does not the same Apostle pronounce *Peace on as many as walk according to the Rule of the New Creature*, Gal. 6. 16.

I further told thee that the *Waldenses*, *Lutherans*, *Protestants*, *Calvinists*, &c. made the Testimony of God in their Consciences the chief Ground of their Belief of the Scriptures, *Reas. against Rail.* pag. 48.

C. *That the* Waldenses, &c. *made the Testimony of*

their

their Conſciences the chief Ground of the Belief of th Scriptures, is confidently ſaid, but more then ever W. Penn *is able to prove.*

Q. But if *W. Penn* is able to prove that the *Waldenſes, Lutherans, Proteſtants, Calviniſts,* yea and *Independents,* and *Anabaptiſts* too, have made the Teſtimony of God in their Conſciences, the Ground of their Belief of the Scriptures, wilt not thou then appear to have told a confident Untruth? Let us hear what they ſay.

That the *Waldenſes* held ſo thou mayſt inform thy ſelf if thou pleaſeſt, out of their Hiſtory, penn'd by *John Paul Perin* of *Lyons,* lib. 1. cap. 1, cap. 11, cap. 13.

Luther taught, *That the Spirit is required to the Underſtanding of the whole Scripture and of every part thereof.* Again, *The Scriptures are not to be underſtood, but by that very Spirit by which they were wrot,* Tom. 3. fol. 169.

John Bradford, a worthy Martyr, thus anſwered the *Arch Biſhop* of *York,* who catechiſed him how he came to know the Scriptures? *We do believe and know,* ſaid he, *the Scriptures, as Chriſt's Sheep, not becauſe the Church ſaith they are the Scriptures, but becauſe they be ſo, being thereof aſſured by the* ſame Spirit *that wrote and ſpake them,* Book Mart. vol. 3. p. 298.

William Tindal, another faithful Martyr in *Hen.* 8 his time, writes thus; *It is impoſſible to underſtand the Scriptures more then a* Turk, *for him that hath not the Law of God written in his Heart to fulfil it.* Again, *Without the Spirit it is impoſſible to underſtand them,* W. Tind. Work. p. 319. & p. 80.

B. Jewel againſt the *Papiſts* hath this Paſſage; *Fleſh and Blood is not able to underſtand the holy Will of God, without* ſpecial *Revelation, therefore Chriſt gave Thanks unto his Father; and likewiſe opened the Hearts*

of

of his Diſciples, that they might underſtand the Scriptures: Without this ſpecial *Help and Prompting of God's holy Spirit, the Scriptures are unto the Reader, be he never ſo wiſe or well learned, as the Viſion of a ſealed Book.*

Calvin ſaith, *It is neceſſary that the ſame Spirit that ſpake by the Mouth of the Prophets ſhould pierce into our Hearts, to perſwade us of the Truth of what they delivered,* Inſtit. lib. 1. cap 8

Beza ſaith, *That the underſtanding of the Scriptures ſhould be fetcht from the* ſame Spirit *that dictated them,* Bez in Nov. Teſt. 2 Pet. 1. 19.

Pet. Martyr taught, *That it is the Spirit of God, that* reveals *the Truth in the holy Scriptures,* Com. loc. p. 2 cap. 18.

H. Bullinger aſſerted in his 4 Decad. & 8 Serm. dedicated to K. *Edw.* 6. *That men fetch the Underſtanding of heavenly things and Knowledge of the Holy Ghoſt from* no where elſe *then from the ſame Spirit.*

What ſayeſt thou to this *T. H?* Can the Holy Ghoſt be this *Diſcoverer* and *Inſtructor*, and yet not *eminently the Rule?*

But inaſmuch as thou chargeſt me with denying the Scriptures Authority, and then raileſt, p. 61. becauſe I place it upon the Teſtimony of the Light and Spirit of God In the Conſcience; Hear what D. *John Owen* ſayes, *The only Publick Authentick and Infallible Interpreter of the holy Scripture, is* He *who is the Author of them. from the Breathing of whoſe Spirit it derives all its* VERITY, PERSPICUITY *and* AUTHORITY, Exerc. 2. 7, 9. VVhat would have become of me, *T. H.* if I had ſpoken ſo broad as this? This makes the Spirit *Interpreter, Judge* and

Rule

Rule of our Knowledge, therefore *eminently the Rule.*

T. Collier, an ancient and conſiderable *Baptiſt*, ſhall be my laſt inſtance here; *There is the Law and Teſtimony in the Spirit*, ſaith he, *as well as in the Letter.*

The Law of God is in the Heart, there it is written; and there it teſtifies the Truth of God: And if any man ſpeak not according to this Rule, it is becauſe there is no Light or Morning riſen in him. See his Works, pag. 249. Again,

Others know no other Touch-Stone nor Tryal, no other Light by which they judge of Truth then Scripture; thus putting it in the room of the Spirit, *which is Light*, and the Greater Light: *For they ſay, they cannot know Truth till they bring it to the* Letter *for Tryal; thus making an* Idol *of the* Letter, *ſetting it up in the room of God*, Ibid. pag. 248.

I could produce a great Cloud of more Witneſſes, both of Fathers and other Authors; But I hope I have diſcharged my ſelf of my Engagement, and made appear, That what I aſſerted was not too hard for me to prove, and therefore thou *T. H.* wert too confident in ſaying ſo: but thy notorious Ignorance in theſe things may a little excuſe thee.

But thou chargeſt us with undervaluing the Scriptures, a Fault I abhor to be guilty of; Let me hear in what.

C. *You contemptibly call the Scriptures the* Letter, *whilſt you entitle ſome of your own Pamphlets*, The Voice of Wiſdom, A Meſſage, &c. *wherein you manifeſtly prefer your own Writings before the Holy Scriptures*, pag 55.

Q. This Cavil has been anſwered again and again,

'I

I told thee before, and thou hast cited me thus, 'If at 'any time we call the Scriptures Letter, it is not that 'we mean our Books are the *Spirit*, or that we 'irreverently set them (the Scriptures) below our own 'Writings, but upon a Comparison only between the 'Scriptures and the Spirit that gave them forth. What Return dost thou give to this?

C. *It is to aggravate, not to excuse your Error.*

Q. Is it an Error to call the Scriptures the *Letter* in a Comparison with the *Spirit*? And an Aggravation of that Error, to prefer the *Spirit* before the *Letter*? But is this all thou hast to say to the Matter?

C. *Why have you not respect to this Comparison when you entitle your own Books? But that you would have us to believe that your Writings are more eminently from the Spirit then the Scriptures?* p. 56.

Q. How do we prefer our *Writings* above the *Scriptures*, which we prove by the *Scriptures*? I perceive it is become almost impossible with thee to make any other Constructions, then what rather shew thine own Envy then our Sense. Was there ever the same Reason for a Comparison between our Writings and the Spirit? Did we ever set them up for the *only Rule of Faith and Obedience, and that in Opposition to the Spirit, as the New Covenant Rule, and those that maintain that Plea?* If there were the same Occasion, thou shouldst quickly hear of the same Distinction and Comparison. But go on.

C. *Hence it is, That when both stand in Competition you thus distinguish them,* Letter, yea, Dead Letter, *as the proper Term for the Scriptures; but* The Voice of Wisdom *to your Books: Art thou not ashamed of this Baseness and Prophaneness?* pag. 56

Q.

Q. Whatever I am, I perceive thou art not aſhamed of making me *baſe* and *prophane* too, and printing a moſt horrid Untruth to render me ſo: There is not a Sentence in thy Book gives a clearer Teſtimony of the Injuſtice of thy Carriage then this in hand. For nothing is more frequent with thee throughout thy *Dialogues*, then firſt to invent ſomething odious in our Name, and then, as if none ſo Modeſt and Righteous as thy ſelf, cry out, *Who would not be aſtoniſhed at this Blaſphemous Abſurdity*? p. 30. *Art thou not aſhamed of this Prophaneneſs and Baſeneſs*? p. 59. *O Impious Man, &c.* p. 13. But let this determine this Point between us. Produce but one of our Friends, that ever brought his VVritings in *Competition* with the Scriptures, calling the Scriptures the *Dead Letter*, & his own Books the *Voice of Wiſdom*, &c. and I will yield thee to have written Truth: If thou canſt not, thou haſt but faſtened *Baſeneſs*, *Prophaneneſs* and *Lying* upon thy ſelf; with thee I leave them; for there thou ought eſt to reſt, till thou canſt better clear thy ſelf of them.

I charged thee with having wronged *Geo. Fox* and *Rich. Hubberthorn*, in making them to ſay, *It is Dangerous for ignorant People to read the Scriptures*; and then fixing the Name of *Jeſuit* and *Romaniſt* upon us; producing their words at large, which thou haſt baſely contracted to thy own Ends, leaving out what might moſt make for their Innocency, and the evincement of thy own Forgery.

Thou giveſt the words thus, *The Letter killeth, is Dangerous*: In my Quotation, and in their own Book, thus, *The Letter which killeth*, 2 Cor. 3. 6. *is Dangerous* [*for thou* (Prieſt) *takeſt it here to war with all againſt the Saints, with thy carnal Mind, giving out thy*

Carnal

carnal Expoſitions upon it.] All this, *T. H.* thou haſt unworthily left out, that thou mighteſt the better faſten thy Fiction upon *G. F.* and *R. H.* I ask, Is it not Dangerous to read the Scriptures to theſe Ends? *And the Miniſters of the Letter are the Miniſters of Death*; here thou leaveſt out again [*which is to Condemnation, and you take it to make a Trade with it, and with what the Propheis, Chriſt and the Apoſtles ſaid, ſo that ſome have* 60 *and ſome* 100 *l. a year; but Chriſt cryed Wo unto ſuch Whited Walls*] having left out this part, that concerned the Hireling thou putteſt in again; *And here you read with Danger who ſpeak of them and ſpeak a Lye, becauſe you ſpeak of your ſelves*: Here again thou letteſt drop [*and you wreſt the Scriptures to your own Deſtruction*] (as the Unlearned and Unſtable do; and is not this Dangerous in them?) Then thou bringeſt in this, *And to you it is Dangerous to read or ſpeak of them*; omitting all that here follows by me cited to clear them of thy Charge, *viz.* [*who know not the Life of them as the* Phariſees, *who were learned in the Letter, but knew not Chriſt: But I ſay, Bleſſed is he that readeth & doth underſtand*] All this ſo neceſſary to give the Underſtanding of their true Meaning thou haſt deſignedly overlookt: However, let us hear what Defence thou haſt made for thy ſelf.

C. *The Queſtion reſpects the* whole Scripture, *which you ſay,* is Dangerous and Killing; The Miniſters of the Scriptures are Miniſters of Death, and it is Dangerous for ſuch to read them: *What a ſhameleſs Man art thou, thus to confeſs what I accuſe you of, and yet condemn me as a Forger?* pag. 57.

2 Theſe foul and confident Queſtions thou uſeſt to ask me with which thou wouldſt inſinuate thy *Innocency*,

do

do but aggravate thy *Forgery*. For *firſt*, How do I confeſs what thou accuſeſt us of, when it is neither to be found in my words, nor theirs upon whom thou chargeſt them, viz. *It is Dangerous for Ignorant People to read the Scriptures*. *2dly*, I told thee they meant by *Miniſters of the Letter*, Miniſters of the Law and Death, becauſe of Tranſgreſſion, and thou makeſt it Dangerous for ſuch to read the Scriptures; whereas G. F. and R. H. ſaid, *It was Dangerous for Hirelings and white Walls to uſe them againſt the Saints with their carnal Expoſitions, oppoſing them* Phariſee-*like, to the Life of them, wreſting them to their own deſtruction*. It is Dangerous for ſuch to read them to ſuch Uſes and Purpoſes not in any Senſe as thou untruly ſayeſt: Of this thou takeſt no notice. So that here the Reader may plainly ſee thy firſt *Forgery*; ſince it was not the Man of no Letters, but the *Men of Letters*, ſuch as the *Scribes* and *Phariſees*, who uſed them againſt the right Heirs of them, of whom G. F. and R. H. ſpoak. And thy *ſecond* is not leſs viſible, in that thou haſt impoſed upon the Reader my Confeſſion of thy Accuſation, who never confeſſed any ſuch thing. Theſe are ſome of thy wonted Tricks, ever & anon imploy'd to cover thy Nakedneſs with, and to get off unſuſpected, from encountering the Difficulty of our Charge, Proof or Argument. I appeal to God's Witneſs in my Reader's Conſcience, to right us againſt the many Injurious Practices againſt us: And ſhall conclude with this Acknowledgment and Argument concerning the Scriptures.

We do receive and believe the *Scriptures* given forth by Holy Men of God, as they were moved of the Holy Ghoſt, *and that they are profitable for Doctrine, for Reproof, and for Inſtruction in Righteouſneſs*; yet ſince they are Writings relating to the things of God, no man can underſtand

understand them, or have an assured Testimony of them, but by the Spirit of God, 1 *Cor.* 2. which alone reveals the deep things of God: It was not the Scripture, but the Father that revealed Christ to *Peter*, *Mat.* 16. 5.

Further, The New Covenat Times are Times of Fulfilling of the Scriptures, by the pouring out of the Spirit, therefore Peoples regard should be to the inward Drawings and Leadings of the Holy Spirit. The *Law* outward was a *Rule* to the *Jew*, though not eminently unto them (for the Lord gave them also of his good Spirit; & what for, if not to rule them?) But the *Law of the Spirit of Life* promised to be reveal'd within, under the New & Everlasting Covenant, was certainly to be the *Rule* under that Covenant, being a time for the more immediate Flowings forth of Spirit and Life. We do not say that every one hath hereunto attained: But we affirm, that God hath given a measure of his Spirit unto Men & Women, that they might receive the pretious Promises, unto wch we direct them for that End. I know that *T. Hicks*, according to his wonted Baseness, *pag.* 49. interprets our saying, that we deny the Scriptures to be the Rule of Faith and Practice in honour to the Divine Light, *to be our denying & rejecting the revealed Will of God*, thereby must hate their Parents, because they are to love Christ first, *Mat.* 10. This were to say, that *Paul's* regard to the Law of the Spirit of Life in him, as his *Rule*, was not to fulfil, but to *deny & reject the Law without*: If this Consequence be false against *Paul*; How can *T. H's Consequence* be good against us? Is it to reject and deny the Scriptures, to have the good things they declare of brought in by the Eternal Spirit? And since the Scriptures can not fulfil themselves in us, but the Spirit,; is not the Spirit the *Rule* and *Guide* to our Divine Knowledge and Enjoyments,

ments. But from our asserting the Spirit to be the Rule, *T.H.* infers, *That we deny to live according to the Scriptures*, a Mistake he fell into before, which I offer'd to help him out of in my Answer; for to own the Scripture to be the Rule, and to live according to the Scriptures, are not one and the same thing: For the *Gentiles* did the things contained in the outward Law, and yet had not the outward Law for a Rule, *Rom.* 2. 14.

Nor is it to be doubted, but that *Paul* and the primitive *Christians* lived up to the outward Law (that is the inward Law outwardly declared) by the Law of the Spirit of Life, which was the Rule of their Obedience: Yet can any infer, that the outward Law and not the inward was the *Rule* of their so living? And I must tell thee, *Th. Hicks*, that thy Exalting of the Scriptures, is but an Endeavour to throw down the Spirit; which *Sacrifice*, be it known unto thee, the Lord of Heaven loathes. And I will say to thee, as *G. F.* and *R.H.* said to the *Priest*, They are Dangerous to be read and used for those Evil Purposes thou employest themupon: But as they said (though that also thou didst overlook) so say I, *Blessed is He that doth read, and understands them.*

Testimonies concerning the Rule.

Irenæus, pag. 242, 384, 389. *The Writing in the Heart is the Rule.* Again, l. 5. c. 8. *The Word giveth his Spirit to all, to some according to Condition.* And, l. 4. c. 30. *The Fathers justified by the Righteousness of the Law in them, therefore had no need of* REPROVING LETTERS.

W. Perkins Works, 3 Vol. pag. 220. *The Light of Nature and Grace teacheth to do as we would be done to*, pag. 221. *It is the Fulfilling of the Law, the* Rule *to*

judge Scripture. That (of God) *made the Rule, Something in the Conscience; Happy Times, if Men would follow it.*

Bp. *R. Sanderson*, De Obligat. Conscient. *pag.* 127. *A Rule of Discerning without the Scriptures.* Regula discernendi extra Scripturam.

And *T. Collier* in plain words saith, *The Spirit of God, who is God, is the* ALONE RULE *of a Christian*, Gen. Epist. to the Saints, chap. 12. —— *The Spiritual Man judgeth all things by the* RULE OF THE SPIRIT, ibid. *The Law of the New Testament is written in the Heart*, ibid.

But what need is there further of my maintaining this Point, concerning *The Light being the Rule in all Ages*; since thou hast made such ample Confession, *That the Godly in all Ages before Christ in the Flesh, were turned from the Darkness to the Light*, pag. 64. This Light must needs be within because the Darkness is there: And it must needs be sufficient, because thou sayest it was that which *Paul* was sent to turn People to, p. 63,64. And what could this Light be for, if not to Guide, Rule and Lead them in the Wayes of Godliness, and consequently the *Rule* of the Godly in all Ages? Therefore the more General Rule, because the Scripture was not in all Ages, and sufficient; because it was of God appointed for the Godly Man's Way, unless thou wilt suppose, that they were turned to an insufficient Light.

§ VI.

§. VI. *Of Commands and Ordinances; particularly* Baptism *and the* Supper.

Quaker, I Have ſufficiently ſhewn under the *Section of Forgeries* the horrid Abuſe thou haſt committed in thy laſt Book againſt *E. Burroughs*, concerning *Commands* and *Ordinances*; I ſhall here further detect thy Miſcarriage.

The Matter charged upon *E.B.* I ſhall ſet down with his Name before it.

E. B. You are not yet dead with Chriſt, who are ſubject to Ordinances.

T. H. *The Spirit of God in the Scriptures aſſures us, that they that keep the Commandments of God are the Children of God*, 1 John 2. 3,4. *Yet this Wicked Man* E. B. *ſaith*, That they who are Subject to Ordinances are not dead with Chriſt [See *Colloſſ.* 2. 19,21.]

Q. E. B. pleads only againſt ſuch Performances under the Name of *Ordinances*, as were but *Shadowy*, *Elementary* and *Periſhing* things, appointed for a Seaſon, and to paſs off. Thus thou thy ſelf haſt quoted me, *Dial.* 3. p. 59. What ſayeſt thou to this?

C. *If thus* E. B. *did plead, why doſt thou ſay I belyed him?* Ibid. p. 59.

Q. Becauſe in thy former *Dialogue* thou madeſt him as well deny to continue Obedience to ſuch eternal Precepts of Righteouſneſs, as thou thy ſelf confeſſeſt the *Light within* dictate, as to *Shadowy*, *Elementary* and *Periſhing* Things. For about his ſaying, *That was not a Command to him, which was a Command to another*,

thou didſt moſt unjuſtly infer, *That the Law which forbids Adultery, Murder, Theft and bearing Falſe Witneſs, is no Law to us*; breaking forth upon us with *Impiouſly Horrid, Ungodly, Irreverent, Patronizers of Blaſphemy, Countenancers of Novices, Prophane Scribler*, with abundance more; whereas *p* 47. of his Works, whence the Paſſage was taken, proves it to have been writ about extraordinary and particular Caſes: as, *Thy Running to Preach, becauſe* Peter *preacht*; or, *Plunging People in the* Thames, *or elſewhere, becauſe* John *baptized many in* Jordan: What ſayeſt thou to this?

C *Thou haſt a ſtrange Confidence! If thou hadſt examin'd the place my Quotation referrs to, thou muſt needs know I have not bely'd you: If thou haſt not, how dareſt thou thus charge me?* p. 58.

Q My Confidence is grounded upon Examination: And this *Ranting Anſwer* will not clear thee. And the greateſt Kindneſs that can be ſhown thee is, to believe thou tookſt the Quotation firſt upon Truſt. But in this *Dialogue* thou art left without Excuſe: For had *E.B.* intended *general Commands*, it would not have coſt thee much more Trouble to prove it, then to ſay it; doubtleſs it would have been a Pleaſure to thee. But as a man guilty, thou art wilfully ſilent about thoſe horrid Conſtructions made upon his words, as the genuine Senſe of the place, and vainly thinkeſt to ſhift it off with accuſing me of ſtrange Confidence: But I return thee thy own Words, *If thou*, T.H. *haſt examined the Place thy Quotation refers to, thou muſt needs know, that thou haſt belyed us: if thou haſt not, how dareſt thou thus* (continue to) *charge us*? But what ſayeſt thou concerning ſhadowy Ordinances?

C. *Foraſmuch as thou confeſſeſt, that* E.B. *did plead*

againſt

againſt ſuch Ordinances as were but Shadows, appointed only for a Seaſon, and to paſs off, that ſuch Ordinances) *are no Commands to us, how wilt thou prove this?*

Q. This is to grant, that thou art for continuing Shadows under a Goſpel-Diſpenſation: My Reaſon againſt it is this; Shadows are Members of the Ceremonial Law, the Subſtance of which is the Goſpel: The bringing in of the Goſpel is the ending of them; becauſe Shadows give way to, and End in their Subſtance. But let me ſee how thou bringſt me in to anſwer thy Queſtion; 'Let it be obſerved, that there is not the leaſt mention 'in all the Epiſtle of *John* of any of thoſe *Ordinances*, 'that ſtood in *viſible* and *corruptible Elements*, ſo that to 'bring in things of a *ſhadowy* and *temporary Nature*, a-'mongſt the Commands of Chriſt, is to abuſe the Apo-'ſtle. What's thy Return to this?

C. *Let it be obſerved what an arrogant, abuſive, prophane and impertinent Man this* W.P. *is. Suppoſe none of the poſitive Inſtitutions of Chriſt be expreſly mentioned in his Epiſtles; did he therefore deny them?* p. 60.

Q. To paſs over thy hard Names, thou doſt ſuggeſt to the *Reader*, as if this were my whole Strength, in Anſwer to thy firſt Query, viz. *How wilt thou prove ſhadowy Ordinances to be no Commands to us?* whereas it was never given by me to any ſuch Queſtion; nor indeed would it have been Proper to do ſo: But ſince thou hadſt ſo little Senſe, as to quote *John*'s Words, viz. *They that love God keep his Commandments*, in order to prove the Continuance of ſhadowy Ordinances, I had ſo much Senſe in me, as to make uſe of thy own citation againſt thee, where no ſuch Ordinances are mentioned, upon which thou fooliſhly queries, did he therefore deny them? which was not the Queſtion. But whether

whether that Place proves them: But this I am bold to infer, *That it was not* John's *Meſſage to recommend and perpetuate them, as thou doſt:* And it is ſtrange to me, that they ſhould be of ſuch Weight in the *Chriſtian* Religion, and not one mention them in all their Epiſtles, ſave *Paul* once, in denying *Baptiſm* a Share in his Commiſſion; and another Time in regulating the *Corinthians* about their diſorderly Uſe of the *Type.* If bodily Exerciſe profits little in Religion, much leſs Shadows. If Men run into external Performances, without the Leadings and Preparings of the Spirit; ſuch Duties cannot be acceptable with God, running into external Imitations without internal Qualifications, gives but to boaſt in another Man's Line: And ſuch Oblations are ſo far from being accepted, that they are abominated. To this let us hear what *T. Collier* will ſay, a Man of greater Eminency and Antiquity than *T. H.* in the *Baptiſt* Way; *I ſee,* ſaith he, *that external Actings according to a Rule without, is nothing, if not flowing from a Principle of Love and Life within,* Works p. 247. I perceive *T. H.* thou art not of that Mind, ſo far from it as to account it Error: But let us hear what elſe thou haſt to ſay, in Defence of thy formal unwarranted Practice.

C. *We are certain, that our Lord did walk in the Obſervance of poſitive Inſtitutions; and he that abideth in Chriſt, ought to walk as he walked,* 1 Joh. 2. 6. p. 61.

2. What makeſt thou *forge, pervert, lye, ſlander* and *abuſe* us then? If thou wouldſt be a *Chriſtian, thou ſhouldſt walk as he walked:* He was *loving* thou art *envious*; he *meek*, thou *paſſionate*; he *long Suffering*, thou *froward*; he was *good* to his Enemies thou *baſe* to thy *Neighbours.* Surely thou haſt forgot that if thou walkeſt, as he walked, thou muſt have

do with that dangerous Doctrine of Perfection, as thou elſe where reputeſt it. But at thy Rate of quoting this Scripture, and following of Chriſt, thou mayſt as well bring in *Circumciſion and the Paſſover, as Baptiſm and the Supper.* Chriſt told his Diſciples, *The Spirit ſhould lead them into all Truth*, after his Aſcenſion; and his beloved Diſciple *John* referred the Churches to the *Anointing*.

C. *You tell us theſe Ordinances were uſed as Figures and Shadows, no longer to endure, then till the Subſtance comes*, viz. The Baptiſm of the holy Ghoſt. *The Reaſon can be no other then the vain Conceit of a deluded mind; for they are no Figures of the Baptiſm of the Spirit; therefore this can be no Reaſon for the aboliſhing of them: Chriſt commands his Apoſtles to teach and baptize, promiſing to be with them to the End of the World.*

Q. Who ever ſaid, that Breaking of Bread was a Figure of the Spirit's Baptiſm? It's a meer Fiction of thy making, as p. 107. of *Reaſ. againſt Rail.* will ſhew. But if Water-Baptiſm and Breaking of Bread are no Figures nor Shadows, they muſt be *Subſtances*, and what Difference then there is between thee and Popery in this Point, let the *Reader* judge. And for Chriſt's bidding his Diſciples, Go, teach, baptizing, *Matth.* 28. I told thee, 'That no Water was 'mentioned; and that *Luke*, in the firſt of the *Acts*, 'ſayes, before the Commiſſion mentioned by *Mat-* 'thew could be given, at leaſt executed, *John bapti-* 'zed with Water, *but ye ſhall be baptized with the holy* 'Ghoſt, *not many Dayes hence:* And then comes the 'Commiſſion in Force; *Go, teach, baptizing*; how? 'with the holy Ghoſt, turning People from Dark- 'neſs to Light, from the Power of Satan unto God.'

C. *If the* Baptism *of the holy Ghost do put this Commission in Force, as thou saist; then the Obligation to those Duties signified in the Commission cannot be taken off: If so, thy Argument falls.*

Q. A poor Shuffle indeed! Does my Argument fall, because thou beggest the Question? which is, *Whether their* Baptism *be with Water or the holy Ghost?*

C. *If* Baptism *of Water be not intended, then none; not the* Baptism *of Afflictions; for the Apostles were not to persecute: Not the* Baptism *of the holy Ghost; for that was a Promise, not a Commission*, p. 63.

Q. Thou dost but trifle with us still: Though *to be* baptized was a Promise, yet *to baptize* was a Commission: *To be baptized not many Dayes hence*, was the Promise of Christ, but *go and baptize all Nations*, which followeth, was a Commission; and that it was with no other *Baptism*, Christ's Distinction sufficiently proves, viz. John *indeed baptized with Water, but ye shall be baptized with the holy Ghost not many Dayes hence*; stay till then; and go, and teach, baptizing all Nations, &c.

C. *To baptize with the holy Ghost, was none of their Duty, it being properly Christ's Work*, p. 63.

Q. It was both their Work and Duty, witness that *Simon Magus* would have bought that Gift of *Peter*: And that *Paul* baptized with the holy Ghost, *Acts* 19. Did he not therein do his Duty?

C. *Is it proper to say, I baptize you with the Spirit into the Name of the Spirit?*

Q. Yes, if thou hast the Spirit; unless thou wouldst make *a counterfeit Christian* of him, whom thou, without the Spirit baptizest into the Name of the Spirit: wouldst thou have a Man *baptized into*

the

the Name, and not into the Nature of the Spirit? Can a Man baptize into Spirit and into Life, *without Spirit and Life?* God did convert, reconcile, baptize, beget and build up Thousands to himself by them, unto whom the Word of Reconciliation was committed, and who were Embassadors in Christ's stead. Now, as for *Water-Baptism*, what *Paul* sayes of himself, I may say of his Commission, It was not behind any of the rest; yet he denies *Water-Baptism* to be any Part of it, and is as plainly rejected of him, in Point of Institution, as any Thing in Scripture. So that either *Water-Baptism* is none of Christ's Institutions; or else *Paul* had no Commission to perform Christ's Institutions, which were strange. *T. Collier* determines this, *The Baptism of Christ is the Baptism of the Spirit.*

But if any of you can shew a larger Commission then *Paul* had, let him produce it; if not, I must conclude they Run, and are not Sent.

---

§. VII. *Of the Doctrine of* Justification

I Perceive by what thou hast writ of Justification, thou intendst to end at the rate thou hast manag'd the Controversie all along; I mean with the same *shuffles* and *injustice*. I will set down thy Charge, the Answer thou makest me give, and thy Reply.

C. *Thou hast boldly affirm'd that* Justification by that Righteousness Christ fulfilled for us, wholely without us, to be a Doctrine of Devils, *Apol.* pag. 148. *What sayst thou to this?* Q. This Apology cited,

Was

was written against a malitious Priest in *Ireland*, Reas. ag. Rail. p. 68. *If thy Position cannot be prov'd it will be no Excuse to say, It was given to a malitious Priest; yea, thy Folly and Rashness is the more aggravated*, &c. p. 96.

Q. As if I had given that Answer, not to inform Persons against whom the Book was writ, and the Occasion of the Passage, but (as one unable to say any thing in my Defence) to extenuate the Fact, and Excuse my writing it. I perceive, rather then want Occasions to Abuse me, thou wilt make them. But what sayst thou concerning Justification?

C. *Thou supposest the Doctrine of Justification by that Righteousness which Christ fulfilled wholely without us, to be a Sin-pleasing and dangerous Notion: What Reason hast thou so to esteem it?* p. 67.

Q. I do so; taking my Words in my Sense, and my Reasons are, 1*st*, Because *wholely without us*, is an unscriptural phrase: 2*dly*, It takes away the necessity of all Inward Work. 3*dly*, No man is justified without Faith. No man hath Faith without Sanctification and Works; therefore the Works of Righteousness, by the Spirit, are necessary to compleat Justification.

C. *Whether a sincere Faith is necessary to our Justification, is one thing: But whether such a Faith be* our sole Righteousness *by which we are Justified, is another*, p. 67.

Q. And whether *T. H.* be not an idle Shifter is another thing. Was it the Question, *Whether our Faith were the sole Righteousness to Justification*; or whether Justification were by a Righteousness *wholy without us and our Faith too?* If a sincere Faith be necessary; then because Faith is not Faith without Work, Justification is not wrought wholely without.

out. I told thee before, that this Doctrine of thine *speaks Peace to the Wicked*, whilst wicked. But there is no Peace to the Wicked, saith my God.

C. *It is horrible wicked to conclude, that what Christ hath done and suffered without us, is to speak Peace to the Wicked, whilest such.*

Q. Right; but who is the Man? Not *W. P.* for opposing a Doctrine which leaves men as wicked as it found them; yea, encourages them in it. I appeal to the sober Reader, if it be all one, to say, *that Justification by the Righteousness of Christ wholely without, which leaves the Conscience as polluted as ever, is to speak Peace to the Wicked, whilest Wicked*, and to affirm, *that what Christ hath done and suffered without us, is to speak Peace to the Wicked, whilest wicked.* Thy indirect Consequences *T. H.* are to obvious and numerous to deceive any ordinary Reader. But what sayst thou to my Distinction about Justification? 'Christ's VVork was two-fold; 1st, to 'remit, forgive or justifie from the imputation of 'sins past, such as truly repent and believe. 2dly, 'By his Power and Spirit working in the hearts of 'such, to destroy and remove the very Nature of 'Sin, to make an end of it, to finish Transgression 'present and to come: The first removes the Guilt, 'the second, the Cause of it: Me thinks this should 'a little allay thy Clamours.

C. *This Distinction of the Work of Christ proves not what thou hast asserted*: viz. *That Justification is not by imputation of anothers Righteousness; much less that such a Justification is a Doctrine of Devils.* p. 72.

Q. This shews thee weary of the VVork, or else thou wouldst not so soon after my Distinction con-

tinu

tinue in thy mis-construction of my VVords, for the clearing of which, my Distinction was made: I grant, that such as Repent and Believe receive Remission, or a justifying from former Sins through the Righteousness of God declared in and by Jesus Christ. But is this *Compleat Justification?* it is a making *Inwardly Just, through a Purging out of Iniquity, and Mortifying of Corruption, and bringing in Christ's Everlasting Righteousness?* If not, then to exclude this, and yet conclude men compleatly justified, by what Christ hath done *wholely without, is a Doctrine of Devils*; for it leaves men in an impure state, and allows the Devils Kingdom to continue in being. In short, it is as much as to say, that *W. Pen* calls what Christ hath done for Men *without*, a Doctrine of Devils, because *W. P. asserts that to be a Doctrine of Devils, which maketh all that is necessary for Mans compleat Justification before God, to have been wrought by Christ wholely without*, thereby excluding the necessity of the *Just-working*, or *Just-making* Power of Christ from Man to that VVork. Well, but I also told thee of the necessity of Faith and Repentance, even to the first part of Justification; consequently, that men cannot be justified in any sense, without regard had to any inward VVork, viz. *Of Sanctification, without which there can be no true Believing.*

C. *Though this be more close to the Point then any thing thou hast spoken, yet it is not close as to prove thy Position: For if Repentance be but a Condition, then it is not the sole* Righteousness *for which we are justified*, p. 73.

Q. Produce me but one Passage of ours that ever spoke that Language, and I will yet say thou hast not wronged us. Besides this Answer is wide from thy

thy purpose, though it comes very close to mine: For from contending for Justification by a Righteousness *wholely without* (the Question) thou art come now to contend against, a Justification by a Righteousness *wholely within*, which was not the Question.

C. *But thou sayst* Abraham's *personal Obedience was the Ground of his being accounted Righteous*: If so, *Then we are not made just by a Righteousness perform'd without us, but by a Righteousness perform'd by our selves. But then, What wilt thou say to this Text*; If *Abraham* were justified by works, he hath whereof to glory, but not before God? *Rom.* 4. 2. p. 77, 78.

Q. The Apostle *James* beares me out in what I said; for if *Abraham* were justified by works, as said *James*, then his Obedience to God's Spirit, which makes up those VVorks, gave him acceptance in God's sight: and let *T. H.* say, if he dare, that *Abraham* was not justified in God's sight, in his resigning up *Isaac* for a Sacrifice; and if he were, how do I err?

But that I might not be thought to oppose one Apostle to another, know, *Reader*, that the Apostle *James* speaks of such Works, as were not performed in *Abraham*'s own strength, but through Faith and his Obedience to God's Spirit; and therefore *Evangelical*. And the Justification they lead to, was a daily Acceptance with God. The Works the Apostle *Paul* speaks of, were *meerly* Abraham's *in his own power* (as those of the *Jews* from the Law) therefore not justifying before God in any sense; least of all could they merit Remission, or purchase *Abraham* those great Blessings and peculiar Favours that it pleased Almighty God to bestow upon him above

others

others. *Works* and *Justification* thus distinguish'd and allow'd, prevent Mens setting one in opposition to the other; and here *Paul* may come in without *contradiction* to James: *If* Abraham *were justified by Works he hath whereof to glory, but not before God.* The whole *Chapter* concerns a justifying by the Remission of Sins that are past, as the following *Verses* evidence: *Even as* David *also describeth the Blessedness of the Man unto whom God imputeth Righteousness without Works; saying, Blessed are they whose Unrighteousnesses are forgiven, and whose Sins are covered. Blessed is the Man to whom the Lord will not impute Sin,* Rom. 4. 6, 7, 8. So that the Righteousness not obtainable by the Works of the Law, *ver.* 16. and the Justification (which *Abraham's* own works could not procure) which is obtain'd by Faith in the Love of God, is here explain'd to be, *the Forgiving of Iniquity, and the covering of Sin.* But this is far from maintaining th *Compleatness* of Justification from a Righteousness *wholely without.*

Testimonies concerning Justification.

Erasmus. *We grant to be justified by Faith,* that is, *Hearts to be purged,* See Fascul. rerum expetend. p. 129. De amabili Eccles. concord.

The Fathers were just by the Righteousness of the Law in them, Iren. l. 4. c. 30.

Noah, Abraham, &c. *were just by the Law natural* (that is eternal) *Tertullian* Adv. Jud. p. 184.

Clem. Alex. saith, *That* Abraham *was justified by Faith, but that Faith he calls* τελειον καθαρισμὸν, *a perfect purgation.* lib. 1. præd.

Justin. Martyr. Defens. ad. Anton. saith, Socrates *lived with the Word*; and *that he knew Christ in part,*

De-

Defens. ad Senat. That was by the Light within: How could he know him otherwise?

Scultetus p. 38. of his Medulla, saith, *There are some at this day of his Opinion, and that do reckon* Melchizedek, Abimelech, Ruth, Rachab, the Queen of Saba, Hiram, Naaman, &c. *among Christians.*

H. Bullinger D. cad. 1. serm. 6. de Justif. *To justifie signifieth to remit offences, to cleanse to sanctifie and to give utterance of Life Everlasting.* Again. *Justification is taken for Remission of Sins, for Sanctification and Adoption into the number of the Sons of God.*

---

§. VIII. *Of Personal Reflections. T. H's Scurrulous Language. The Conclusion.*

THou accusest me with defending and justifying E.B. in *Cursing, Railing and Lying, and that in the Name of the Lord*, Dial. 3. p. 10, 82, 83. where it is to be observed, that thou doest not onely esteem it so thy self, but supposest me both to confess it to be such, and that notwithstanding I warrant it from the Lord. These are thy *black and odious Insinuations and Conclusions*, as may at large be seen in the pages, before mentioned as if to deny them to be such, were to affirm them such; for I know not by what other *Figure* I allow them such. But because this cannot appear less then an absurd and incredible *Lye*, to all that have their senses, I shall the less heed it; But what Proof doest thou bring that E. B. *curses, lyes and railes*? To call what he sayes by such hard Names, concludes no such thing. All I see is, that thou runst to the words by him utter'd, as if a Repetition

petition were a Proof: Poor Man! This it is to be upon the Fret, Proud and Passionate: E. B. must *curse, lye and raile*, because *thou sayst so*. Is not this to act the Dictator with a witness? The Truth is I scarce think there ever was a fouler. But thou stomackst my saying *that the Scripture allows those Names*, and retor'st, *it seems you can make the Scripture your Rule for Lying, Cursing and Railing*. But this is as irreverently said of the *Scripture* as abusively of us, and absurdly in it self; can any man make them his Rule for that which is *impious*? I had thought that at what time any act wickedly, they cease to make them their Rule. Shall I make one of thy Conclusions now against thee? *T. Hicks says, the Scripture may be a Rule for Lying, Cursing and Railing*. But is every Example a Rule? a Rule always relates to Duty; a President or Example not. Is it my Duty to call bad men by all the *Names* mentioned in Scripture, because there are such Examples? What then should I call *Thee*, that art as bad a man, every jot, as the worst of them? This shews that the Scripture cannot be a Rule in an hundred such Cases, but the *particular measure of wisdom* from God, that is always present, and gives to understand and apply things suitably, and not upon mere Imitation, where thy *Religion*, such as it is, stands. I say, that our justifying our Practice by the *Example* of Scripture, does not conclude it our Rule, or any man's whatsoever, in so citing it: And therefore thy thread-bare Answer, *it seemes you are forc'd to make Scripture your Rule to prove this or that*, is out of doors and to be despised, as plausible as it looks: Again, if the Scriptures be our Rule in any particular cases

(and

(and I think we live up to it more then thou dost witness thy *three impious Dialogues*) yet this concludes not the matter in Question for thee; since it proves not the Scriptures to be *eminently the Rule*, or the most *eminent or general Rule*, &c. But T. H. why has E. B. transgress'd more than either *Prophets* or *Apostles*, yea then *Christ* himself, when he (to such carnal men as thy self) seemed so unkind and harsh in his Answer and Rebuke of *Peter's* Love and Care of him, as to say, *Get thee behind me Satan*? The Priest that E. B. gave those Names (no one of which was harder then Satan) was never half so kind to him, as *Peter* was to Christ; Nay, they were entrapping Questions; such as they used to assault Christ with, when they sought occasion against him, whom he called *Children of the Devil*. And we know that some of thy race *T. H.* in the former times when power was in your Hands, diligently sought matter against us: *G. Fox* was about the same time indicted for *Blasphemy*, and endeavours great in some of the old *Pharisaical* stock, thy Brethren, to take away his Life. E. B. knew whom and what he answer'd: And I do say, that by thy Argument about the *Scriptures being the Rule*, without, further Regard thou oughtest to stop thy Mouth, unless thou canst prove that E. B. had not the same Warrant the holy men of old had, to name thy Predecessors by; to do which, thou must come to the discerning of Spirits: And by what wilt thou perform that enquiry and Judgment? How canst thou tell, whether a man using Christ's Words to *Peter*, to a loving Disswader of him from Sufferings, that onely intends his Good, is well or ill done? The Scripture is no Rule for our discerning aright

this caſe; nor is it his Duty, in caſe he be in the right, becauſe Chriſt's words are there recorded, unleſs he be thereto prompted, of the ſame Power: Yet if he ſay ſo, and be reproved by any; 'tis and muſt be granted that there is an Example which ſhuts the Mouthes, or ſhould do, of all who reſpect the Scripture; which is our caſe with thee. Well, but Chriſt had no Provocation by *Peter's* words, but the Spirit that lurkt in them, which favour'd not the Work of God then doing; To reliſh the like caſe aright there muſt be the ſame Spirit; which *T. H.* rejecting for the Rule of right Judgment, to be ſure he can be no right Judge of *E. B.* But upon his own Opinion ought to be ſilent from further Clamour againſt him, and repent of his *ſcurrulous reproachful Language*, with which he has ſo often run over his Grave.

But thou chargeſt p. 86. *Nicholas Lucas* with ſaying, *That if the Bible were burnt, as good an one might be writ*, and though he denies it, yet thou tell'ſt us, *it is never the leſs a Lye for that*; and that he knows his Accuſers. But ſuppoſe it were true, had it not more become an *Anabaptiſt*, and a Preacher too, (eſpecially, when one of the Scriptures in thy Title Page is, *A Man that is an Heretick, after the 1ſt and 2d Admonition reject, who never dealt ſo with either him or us, that thou ſo haſt publickly writ againſt as ſuch*) firſt to have dealt with N L. about it; and granting he had been ſo obſtinate in a wicked Saying, as thou Dialogueſt him to be, had this been a ſufficient Ground for thee to charge it upon the Perſons and Principles of the People called *Quakers?* But now thou haſt given the World a Saying to meaſure us by, that firſt is of ſeveral years ſtanding, and but lately

lately raked up, and might have been either at first *miſ-apprehended*, or ſome word *forgotten* or *miſ-placed*. 2*dly*, That N. L. denies that he ever ſpake it, by a ſerious *Certificate* in *G. W's Append.* confirm'd by *H. Stout*, appeal'd to by thy *Anabaptiſt* Informers, which thou haſt not ſo much as attempted to invalidate. 3*dly*, That he abhors the Matter contained in the Story, and that without all mental Reſerves. And 4*thly*, That it's charged upon, and made to be the Meaſure of *Us* and our *Principles* and *Motions*, thereby making us to blaſpheme God's Spirit, as well as reprobate Scripture, (and that with no ſmall Aggravation) who are innocent, by never ſpeaking the Words, by never countenancing ſuch Words, & by not holding the Matter directly or indirectly contained in them; and we do utterly renounce and abhor both the one and the other. Well, *T. Hicks*! God will plead our Cauſe againſt the Malignity of thy Slanderous Spirit: No Juſtice, no Diſcretion could ever have led thee to this monſtrous pitch of Abuſe: thou ſheweſt how glad thou art to bedirt us, by making other Folks *Lyes* thy *Charges*, and then inſiſting on them with as much Confidence, as if thou wert infallibly aſſured of every jot. But we have ſome cauſe to ſuſpect thee more then ever; thy Tale wears ſo many Dreſſes: One while it is, *Thou mayſt burn thy Bible, and write as good an one thy ſelf*, Contin. p. 5. Another while, *We may burn our Bible, and make as good an one our ſelf*, Dial. 3. pag. 3. And laſt of all, it is to go thus, *If the Bible were burnt, as good an one might be writ*, ibid. p. 86. Now, T. H. anſwer; thou that pretendeſt to ſuch punctuality, which of theſe are we to take? The *firſt* is un-

unlikely, becauſe what ever we think we could do, to be ſure thou canſt not think that a *Quaker* ſhould have ſo good an Opinion of an *Anabaptiſt Woman, as that ſhe could write another Bible as good as this*, that we are ſure underſtands not this. If we muſt take thee in thy *ſecond* Account, then the Woman is out in her firſt Story: If in the *laſt* Relation of this *Fiction*, then it concerns the *Quakers* no more then the *Anabaptiſts*. For ſuppoſe the World were under one Emperor, and he ſo *impious* as to enjoyn the burning of all the Bibles, and all were burnt; I hope they are not ſo *irreligious* as to limit God's Power, who is Almighty, that he could not furniſh us with one as good as this, eſpecially, ſince *Chriſtians* would elſe, as you muſt hold, be without a Rule: for I would have thee take notice *T. H.* that thou haſt ſo materially varied in thy Charge, that now it is not, whether, if the Bible were burnt, any Man could make as good an one; but whether if it were by ſuch Impiety burnt, *as good an one might not be writ*, which words are general. Here, T. H. to give the——his due, thou haſt helpt thy *Fiend Quaker*, by bringing him in, ſaying, what T. H. unleſs he would queſtion God's Omnipotency, dare not deny.

But to conclude, either theſe Miſtakes proceed from the firſt Authors, or from T. H. If from the *firſt Authors*, why ſhould they be credited at all, who ſhow ſuch incertainty? if from *T. Hicks*; what Reaſon has he to be ſo infallibly ſure of their Memories, who is not ſure of his own *Books*, much leſs of his own Memory being found in ſuch manifeſt *Variations*? But ſince every juſt Judge accounts that Accuſer and Witneſs of little Credit, that are found divers

divers and inconsistent in their Stories; I hope my sober *Reader*, who is made judge betwixt us, will in justice cashier *T. Hicks* from all Credit with him in these attempts. But as against *N. L.* so against *S. Eccles* T. H. has published a *foul Slander*, viz. *That he should say, the Scriptures were a Lye.* This *G. W.* Append. p. 12. reflected upon thee, as an abusive and false Charge; To which I cannot find that thou sayst any more then this, *that one of thy Witnesses against* N. L. *can testifie, that* S. E. *said, he used Scripture, onely to satisfie him.* Dial. 3. p. 86. Doubtless that Witness has long Eares, thou hangst so fast by them. But he *can* witness it. But why *does* he not? Is that *Put-off* like to confirm the Charge? But granting thy Witness remembers better against S. E. then N. L. Does S. E's. saying, that he us'd Scripture to satisfie his Opponent, prove, that he said, *the Scriptures were a Lye?* Do men use to prove Truths by Lyes? Doth not this make S. E. imply the Lye to his own Principles, which he quoted Scripture to prove real Truths; What sayst thou *T. H.* Is this to evince the truth of thy Objections and Charges against the *Quakers*, and secure thy Credit with thy own and other People, that carries with it what merits the Detestation and Rebuke of every honest mind?

But that thou mayst go out with the same *braving Rant* thou camest in with, and the like Honesty, thou tellest thy Reader, *that W. P. is guilty of wilful Lying, in saying, that thou disingenuously slankedst from a publick Meeting, and evadedst the offer made thee by G. W. to that purpose:* It is not unlikely but thou takest thy old Way of proving, which is in the end to detect thy self of that thou chargest me with the Guilt of. *First* thou sayst, *that long before my Book was out, thou didst*

desire to meet with me, and I refused. But doth this prove me guilty of wilful *Lying*, in charging thee with evading the offer made for a publick Disputation? Are the termes of a Meeting for a publick Disputation in thy Answer? If not, How does thy Answer reach the Question? VVell, But I refus'd; to do what? *To meet a Man in* private *that had twice printed a Knave, a Fool, an Heretick, a Blasphemer*; and I know not how much more, either in those Termes or in Circumlocution, to the VVorld: No such matter, *T. H.* I never intend to release thee from the Burden and Shame of so many publick and manifest Villanies as thou hast committed against me, a Stranger to thee in all respects, and my Friends in general; that it may be never heard of such a man. Besides, Let me tell thee, I look upon thee to be so base a Person, that as I shall always desire to have nothing to do with thee (for that cause, and not thy Abilities) so I never intend to trust my self in such private manner with any man, that is detected of such notorious *Perversion, Lying and Forgery*; there being no Security to any one in common conversing with thee; save that thou deservest no Credit against any man, who hast so publickly forfeited all Credit in thy numerous *fictions against us.* But to prove thou hast not evaded the publick Meeting, thou tellest thy Reader, *that thou didst send six Questions to G. W. to debate them upon notice in a convenient time and place; that he refus'd; therefore G. W. did both shuffle and lye*; which is the *great shuffle* of thy 3d. Dial. in *little*, or the *Evasion* of thy whole Book *Epitomized*: For as thou hast pretended in thy 3d. *Dial.* that the Evincement of thy own Objections, was all that we required or stood thee upon to do; so here

thou

thou makeſt as if the Diſcuſſing of thoſe Objections (herein conſider'd) had bin all, there was any ground to diſpute upon; which was for thee, who art the *Abuſer, to chuſe a Charge for the abuſed to inſiſt upon.* But why didſt thou not tell thy *Reader*, that *G. W. firſt ſent thee a Charge in writing; and that he offered in a publick Auditory to prove thee guilty of* Forgeries, Self-contradictions, *and* groſs Errours, *from thy own Dialogues*? Inſtead of yielding to the Teſt, even about matter of Fact, where thou haſt groſſely abus'd us, thou didſt in plain termes ſhuffle by a freſh propoſal of *Queſtion*; as if thou wert to teach us where and what to charge our Enemies with; and then preſcribe Rules (with many taunting Expreſſions, omitted in thy 3d Dial,) how to behave our ſelves, on purpoſe to evade the Meeting. I would have thee know, it was our Right to make the *Complaint*; and hadſt thou been a *man of any Honeſty*, thou wouldſt readily have conſidered it, and joyn'd iſſue upon our Charge: This, in Reputation to thy ſelf, as well as *Juſtice* to us, thou oughtſt not to have declin'd; And yet to aggravate theſe ſhuffles *G. W.* proffer'd in his 4th paper to thee *a note of the particulars charg'd as Forgeries &c. if thou deſiredſt it*; ſo willing was he and others to have ſeen thee in a publick Auditory. But ſeeing this would not do, he and I went to *John Gladman's*, deſiring him to offer thee from us, *we wou'd meet thee, and who elſe to defend thee, in a publick Auditory with thy* Dialogue *in one hand and the Bible in the other*; the faireſt of tenders; to make thy own Book the *Subject*; *and the Scriptures*, (thou ſayſt we reprobate) A *Rule*. But this thou canſt not but know was alſo rejected: So that to conceal theſe *Shifts*, nay, to ſay thou art no *Shuffler*, and which

is worſe, to charge *G. W.* with both *Shuffling* and *Lying*, *at what time thou art ſo manifeſtly guilty of both, as to highten thy Unworthineſs to a monſtrous pitch.*

But as the *Matter* of thy Book is injurious, ſo thy *Language* inſolent and ſcurrulous; intitling us *Cheats, Impoſtors, a mad, arrogant, abuſive, prophane Man, Knave*, in diſcourſe [*Coxcomb*] *impious Curſers, Lyars, Blaſphemers, moſt implacable Enemies to the Chriſtian Religion, as vile Impoſtors as ever were, influenced and inſpired by the grand Impoſtor the Devil*; calling our Religion, *malignant Errors, a myſtical Romance, Satan's Snares, Blaſphemy, blaſphemous Abſurdities, I proclaim to the World, that your Religion is a meer Cheat, calculated only to the Service of the Devil, and your own Luſts*; and abuſing our religious Language with ſuch like Expreſſions as theſe; *Impertinent Canting; your idle non-ſenſical and blaſphemous Prating*; Termes that as much unbecome thy Pretences, as they reſemble the reſt of thy Practices. Canſt thou with good Conſcience upbraid E. B. with rebuking a Prieſt in *Scripture Language*, whilſt thou haſt taken the Liberty, throughout thy *Dialogues*, when and where thou wert never provok'd, of ſuch foul and frothy Expreſſions, as becomes not any Man writing of *Religion*? Is this to make the Scripture thy *Rule*; or to act the *Chriſtian* againſt the *Quaker*? and to prove the *Quaker* none? No ſuch matter T. H. but much the contrary, and that in the minds of not a few, and thoſe too, of thy own Way, though of a better Spirit, who have diſown'd them, Root and Branch. I would not, after thy Example, *reprobate* all with thee, God forbid: That God has turned theſe ill deſign'd Attempts to our Advantage, remember what ſort of *Salute* was lately given thee,

by

by a Religious and Ingenious Person in *Bristol* (once a *Preacher* among the *Independents*) at thy reflecting upon his adhering to the Way we profess, viz. *That he read thy* Dialogues *before he ever read the* Quakers *Books (or Answers) and that the disingenuity of that Dealing (apprehending it to be no real* Dialogue) *was a* FURTHERANCE *of his* INQUIRIES, *and so of his* CONVICTIONS, *grounded upon thy* ABUSES; an Argument never to be answer'd by thee, T. H. if thou shouldst write Three *Dialogues* more, unless they were as remote from these as thou wert from Honesty when thou writ'st them; who doest first *Forge*, and then *Lye* and *Rail* to maintain it.

Think not with these *Comical* Courses to obtain thy Ends upon us, nor raze the Foundation of our *Religion* by thy abusive *Interludes*; in which thou hast not *imitated* Christ, but Ap'd the prophane Stager; writing a sort of *Mock-Religion* instead of solid Controversie; therein playing the Humourist with the Vulgar, like *Aristophanes* of old, (though with worse Malice, and less Wit) who sacrific'd the Vertue and Gravity of *Socrates* and his Friends, to please their Enemies, and profit himself; the Hinges on which thy *Dialogues* turn. The *First* is manifest, and so is the *Last* to the value of 300 Books at an Impression [if some of thy Assistants do not wrong thee, as we suppose not] (ask the Bookseller else) besides *Perquisites*; hereby proving thy self, *one of those unruly Vain-Talkers, who writest things thou ought'st not for filthy Lucre sake*, applyed to us in thy *Title-page*, but due to thy Self.

And however *sweet* these Courses may relish to thy worldly Palate, thou wilt find them deadly *Poysons* in the End; at what time thy own *Dialogues*,

logues, and not I, nor any influenced by me, will prove so many ASSASSINATORS in thy own Bowels. God, if it please him, give thee Repentance, that thou mayst escape his fierce VVrath to come. Amen.

Now sober *Reader*, I shall address my self to thee, and God's righteous VVitness in thy Conscience, whether I have acquitted my Self in this Controversie as becomes a *Christian-man*, against the Violent & Unfair Assaults of my Adversary? and if I may not with very good Reason conclude, that he has all this while but *counterfeited* the *Christian*, and *abused* the *Quaker*; and consequently, that he (and not the real Quaker) *is quite* [illegible] *thing then a Christian?* Let Righteous Judgment take place.

p3d 5th Mon. 1674. } *A true Lover, and hearty Wisher of thy Souls Felicity,* W. P.

Not every one that sayth *unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven; but he that* doth *the will of my Father which is in Heaven*, Mat. 7. 21.

For he is not a Jew *which is one outward; neither is that Circumcision which is outward in the Flesh: But he is a* Jew *which is one* inwardly, *and Circumcision is that of the* Heart in the Spirit, *and not in the* Letter, *whose Praise is not of Men but of God*, Rom. 2. 28, 29.

But as then he that was born after the Flesh persecuted him that was born after the Spirit, even so it is now, Gal. 4. 29.

But be of good chear I have overcome the World, Jo. 16. last.

Pag. 13. *line* 7. *read* two first Dialogues. p. 34. l. 32. r. Dial. 3. p. 41. p. 35. l. 28. r. spoak. l. 31. r. was. p. 41. l. 26. r. 76. p. 46. l. 14. r. of his.

A *Poſtſcript* by another Hand.

WE expect to hear what the *Baptiſts* in and about *London* will ſay (as being *appeal'd to*) concerning their Brother *Thomas Hick*'s Proceeding in his *Three Dialogues*, and whether they approve thereof, or of ſuch *Play-Books*, or *Romances about Religion*, yea or nay; for they are highly concerned to give Judgment, and to be plain to the World herein, *as they tender the Glory of God, and Reputation of Religion*, &c.

NOw, if you the Teachers and Elders, &c. among the *Baptized People*, do not publickly clear your ſelves of *Thomas Hicks*, and theſe his unjuſt Proceedings againſt us; and hereafter he further perſiſts therein, VVe may take it for granted, that you own his VVork; and may juſtly deal with him, and purſue him, not only as *Tho. Hicks*, but as the *Baptiſts* great Champion, peculiar Agent, or Repreſentative. But if you ingenuouſly clear your ſelves of him and his Corrupt, Perverſe VVork; then his future Miſcarriages will be chargeable only upon *T. Hicks* himſelf, and you will appear to the VVorld, ſo far clear thereof; and approve your ſelves the more honeſt and ſincere towards, God, Truth and Religion.

THE END.